

[*see pdf notes at the bottom on formatting. Any red **emphases** are mine, not CPPAs; any green in brackets are my comments.] [this is otherwise an email alert rec'd 3 Feb. 2014]

CA Protective Parents Association

Dear Friends,

We are delighted to announce our Media Campaign has begun. Stop Abuse Campaign has taken up the family court crisis as a top priority!
www.stopabusecampaign.com*

[Apparently it's assumed NO ONE will ever check out a group's corporate or nonprofit status or locations. This one simply doesn't "Check out" even the most routine lookups. It has a strange corporation history spanning so far, about 5 different states, and the last known tax return (2011) I could see, was in debt having taken out a \$15K loan. It has two SIMULTANEOUS corporate registrations (one in FL, one in NY) and the website says, send checks to NY (where it's NOT showing registered as a charity). On the IRS lookup pages, the same EIN# shows registered under two different names, in two different states within a short timeframe. However the FL corporation (shown on tax return) now displays a NJ address (no known board members live in FL, and the founder (first incorporator) Mr. Itzkowitz now shows a Pennsylvania address.

One look at the contents of the website above, by those familiar with the Crisis in the Courts Crowd, reveals it is slavishly following their agenda, and set of experts. There's a lot more than meets the eye here. Because this printout is about CPPA mail alerts (more so than Stop Abuse Campaign), although they are related -- I'll move the rest of this commentary to the end of this document.

CPPA is selective on which groups are referenced on the circulation list, and which are not, particularly anyone who isn't on board with the "Our Group of Consulting Experts" and "Lets Get Congressional Hearings to present our POV." Open dialogue and dissent (from among the same class of women dealing with custody transfers to abusive parents), not encouraged. See my NAMES post 30 Aug. 2013, or LOOK UP A NONPROFIT (Impromptu How-To) 9 April 2013, blogger <http://familycourtmatters.wordpress.com/>

The focus is on getting **Congressional Oversight Hearings** on the family court crisis.

Three Things You Can Do To Make Congressional Oversight Hearings Happen.

1/. **Sign the petitions** We need 600 signatures a week to hit our target of 10,000 signatures by the end of March. Links to the petitions on Causes.com and on Change.org will be on www.stopabusecampaign.com. (It looks like this link may be under construction at this moment.)

2/. **Launch a personal campaign** on Causes.com to support our call for oversight hearings. Gather some signatures for it. We'll feature the best personal campaigns on the Stop Abuse Campaign website and on social media. We'll send a white Mothers of Lost Children T-Shirt to the first 5 people who get 100 signatures for their personal campaign.

3/. **Tell your story.** Send us your story using pseudonym as needed. The stories should be only a few paragraphs, no more than a page, and might be edited as needed. Send stories to [Links like personal email address & name deleted](mailto:links.like.personal.email.address&name.deleted)

US DOJ

The request by US DOJ for cases of criminal events in which the children were placed with the accused perpetrator is gearing up. There was an odd running together of "at" with the correct email for the US DOJ information. The correct email is: ricourtcon@gmail.com and Mary Seguin is the contact person.
[**This was found on WWWeb, so not deleted]

NPEIV

The public policy committee of **National Partnership to End Interpersonal Violence (NPEIV)** has reviewed and approved a public policy statement on the family court crisis which will be posted on their website www.npeiv.org shortly. This is a big step!

MEDIA

Tell Nicholas Kristof of the New York Times that we need 2014 to be the year of talking about the family court crisis.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/05/opinion/sunday/kristof-first-up-mental-illness-next-topic-is-up-to-you.html?emc=eta1&r=0>

Reporter **Mike Volpe** has received information of repeated corruption by Dr. **Stanton Samenow**, a court appointed expert who often testifies in high conflict custody cases all over the US but especially in Virginia. If anyone has been evaluated by Dr. Samenow, Mike Volpe would like to speak with you. Contact him at his email [email deleted] or cell phone [\[tel# deleted\]](tel:#.deleted)

From the trailers of the new film on family court, Divorce Corps, the producers show the financial devastation well, but are way, way off the mark on domestic violence and child abuse. They describe these crimes as "false allegations" and continue the dangerous myths that equal parenting is best for children. This is uneducated and contrary to real research.

EVENTS

April 5, 2014 Child Sexual Abuse Conference. **Incest Survivors Speakers Bureau and California Protective Parents Association** are co sponsoring our 20th conference. Childhood Trauma: Focusing on Solutions. Wendy Murphy, attorney, media spokesperson, author, and specialist in crimes against women and children is our renowned keynote speaker. She is a former child abuse and sex crimes prosecutor, and is now an adjunct professor and trial and appellate attorney specializing in crime victims. www.wendymurphyllaw.com The conference is free to the public and to professionals. 9:30 am to 5:00 pm at the Veterans' Memorial Center, 203 East 14th Street, Davis, CA.

May 9-12, 2014 Mothers Day March. Mothers of Lost Children will be marching again in Washington D. C. to insist our government respond more effectively to children who report abuse, are removed from their safe protective mothers, then given to their dangerous abusive fathers by family (divorce) courts. There will be a mini-Battered Mothers Custody Conference on Friday and Saturday of that weekend. (Mo Hannah is taking a year off and has given permission for the name to be used). Friday May 9 will be a training led by Barry Goldstein focused on advocates, attorneys, and mothers. Saturday May 10 will be a healing day for mothers to learn ways to mother their children under extreme duress. **Mothers Day May 11 will be a march at the White House and on Monday, May 12**

we will have our lobbying day, with hopefully another Congressional Briefing. The location of the conference is tentatively at the George Washington University. We are hoping to keep the cost very low, and you will need to find your own accommodations, such as the International Hostel or the William Penn House or possibly a hotel through organizations like Priceline or Travelocity.

May 17 - 18, 2014 conference: "Survivors Supporting Survivors," at the Executive Inn & Suites in Oakland, CA. The 2014 conference honors the 25th anniversary of Survivorship, the longest established organization in the country serving survivors of mind control and ritual abuse. **Keynote Speaker is Jennifer Freyd, Ph.D.** and will be talking on What we have learned about Interpersonal and Institutional Betrayal Trauma. Jennifer J. Freyd, PhD, is Professor of Psychology at the University of Oregon and directs a laboratory investigating the impact of interpersonal and institutional trauma on mental and physical health, behavior, and society. <https://survivorship.org/survivorship-ritual-abuse-and-child-abuse-2014-conference/>

PETITION

Elsa Newman still languishes in prison in Maryland.
<http://www.thepetitionsite.com/5/Free-Elsa-Newman/>

ORGANIZED CRIME?

1. Kids for Cash
<http://movies.yahoo.com/blogs/movie-news/kids-cash-trailer-premiere-exposes-shocking-case-judicial-221004808.html>
2. Franklin Coverup
<http://topdocumentaryfilms.com/the-franklin-cover-up/>
3. Judge dismisses lawsuit alleging child porn ring

[[NOTE: this "news" is 13 years old??]]

Jan. 10, 2001 Bangor Daily News

ROCKLAND - A court case involving a former state Department of Human Services caseworker who claimed the department covered up a child pornography ring in 1985 has been dismissed.

Cynthia Wellman of Camden filed the lawsuit in October, claiming that she was forced into disability retirement because she refused to participate in the alleged conspiracy.

According to Wellman's lawsuit, she was a senior caseworker in 1985 when she began investigating information that involved a number of children being sexually exploited and abused by a group of adults in both Hancock and Penobscot counties. Her research allegedly led to a significant drug operation and the professional photographing and videotaping of children engaged in sexual activities.

[[This should 13-yr-old "News" about such rings in the 1980s, naturally connect to The Franklin Coverup (Nebraska), which is known to relate to such a ring, also in the 1980s, the filming of children there engaged in activities WITH politicians, etc. was used to blackmail politicians (with bad addictions), while also feeding their addiction. The Franklin Coverup story [footnoted, but not narrated or abstracted below, at all...]]only came to light when EMBEZZLEMENT issues were being investigated. Yet CPPA and friends don't want to talk about the money trail -- at all. What a missed opportunity, and message for people who report. The "Franklin Coverup" material reaches to the White House, but the focus of CPPA is continuing to bring people TO Congress and the White House as though this did not exist!]]

Court documents stated that Wellman claimed that **members of the University of Maine staff and faculty** were involved in a pornography ring and that equipment from the university was likely used to film the youngsters.

On Friday, Knox County Superior Court Justice Francis Marsano dismissed the case, citing the statute of limitations.

<http://archive.bangordailynews.com/2001/01/10/judge-dismisses-lawsuit-alleging-child-porn-ring/>

[[Why is this information included in a CPPA 2014 alert?]]

BOOKS AND BLOGS

1. Book by Lynda Allen secretgardenthymes@yahoo.com,
<https://www.createspace.com/4351494>
<http://www.amazon.com/dp/1490926461>

2. Books by Barbara Whitfield
<http://www.barbarawhitfield.com/>
Victim to Thriver and Survivor: Carole's Story
Hope for survivors of childhood trauma, abuse or neglect Deep healing is possible with knowledge, the courage to face buried pain, and the love of safe others. Carol's riveting true story is intertwined with my life and that of my husband Charles Whitfield, MD (author of the bestselling Healing the Child Within). This is our story, too, of walking together with Carole along her path of recovery. This book includes the latest research from the Centers for Disease Control on the Adverse Childhood Experience (ACE) Study.

3. Blog by Barry Goldstein
Lies of the Fathers (Rights Groups)
<http://timesupblog.blogspot.com/2013/12/lies-of-fathers-rights-groups.html>
sref=fb

by Barry Goldstein

The United States Department of Justice offered some good news to long suffering protective mothers and their children when it announced grants to courts in Illinois, Delaware, Minnesota and Oregon to develop improved practices to protect battered women and their children. Incredibly, the abusers' lobby objects to any possible reforms to promote children's safety out of concern the improved practices might undermine the privilege of abusive fathers to maintain strict control over their victims. The National Parents Association, formerly Fathers and

Families wrote a distorted article attacking the Office on Violence Against Women and the Battered Mothers Justice Project, which is one of the organizations working to help the courts create effective reforms.

I normally try not to pay much attention to these male supremacist groups because I witness enough traumas without listening to their attempted justifications and they tend to live in a reality deprived world. My friend Eileen King, the founder and director of Child Justice asked me to write an article to correct the misinformation that permeates the article from the National Parents Association. In reading their article I was reminded of a friendly disagreement I sometimes have with Joan Meier of DVLEAP. I am a strong supporter of the use of current scientific research because the use of good research would inform the courts and create better outcomes for children. Joan often expresses concerns that the abuser groups will use their bogus research to justify continued harm to our children. This is exactly the kind of material relied on in their article. Joan is, of course, right that flawed research can and is used to mislead the courts and they do not always recognize the difference.

While I regularly discuss research that comes from the Department of Justice and Center for Disease Control, the abuser rights groups rely on "research" based only on the personal beliefs and biases of a man who made many public statements to the effect that sex between adults and children can be acceptable. It is hard to imagine that judges could not appreciate the difference if the lawyers present the information effectively. Nevertheless we have seen all too many cases where bogus studies are the ones relied on by the courts.

In deep appreciation of the wonderful work Eileen does, I will go through some of the false claims made in their article and then discuss the more encouraging topic about the impact of the grants to the four court systems.

What about Male Victims?

There are men who are assaulted and seriously mistreated by their female partners. This is a horrendous situation and should not be tolerated, period. There are sincere people working on this issue and it is a worthy cause. Unfortunately many abusive fathers use and exaggerate this issue as a way to nullify and negate the work to end men's violence against women.

One of the first articles I wrote for this blog demonstrated the falsity of articles and "research" claiming that women abuse men about as often as men abuse women. Some of this propaganda such as those cited by the abuser lobby is produced by professionals who are part of the cottage industry that makes its money helping abusive fathers gain custody from safe, protective mothers. Some of this research is produced by sincere but unqualified researchers who do not understand domestic violence dynamics and fail to consult with genuine experts. These researchers like the court professionals we see in custody cases possess a false sense of competence about domestic violence and so don't seek the help and expertise they need.

A good example of this came in a workshop I attended at an IVAT conference in Hawaii. Two young female psychologists who had been students of the conference organizer presented their findings based on a grant they had received. They claimed their research proved that abuse by men and women was roughly equal and described their methodology. It turned out they got their information from questionnaires filled out by men they found on web sites. Most of the men came from "fathers' rights" organizations. This was hardly a neutral or reliable source, but they accepted everything the men said uncritically. At one point they said that the police refused to bring charges against the men's alleged abusers because of the bias against men who claim to be assaulted. It never occurred to the psychologists that the police did not bring charges after investigating the claims and finding a lack of evidence.

There are many common mistakes unqualified researchers make that lead to the mistaken results. This "research" is often based on phone calls to the general population and reliance on the discredited conflict tactics scales. Results from phone calls to the general public distort the results because it will usually be safe for the men but not the women to reveal assaults. It would also focus on less serious assaults than would be found in a survey from emergency rooms or shelters. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that abusive men are more likely to make false allegations and women routinely minimize the abuse committed by their partners. The researchers' lack of familiarity with domestic violence dynamics means they are not even aware of the inevitable distortions in their data.

The conflict tactics scales are designed to just count the hits. No distinction is made based on the fact that in general men are bigger and stronger than women, hit harder and cause more serious injuries. The findings by the unqualified researchers are belied by good research that demonstrates women are far more likely to need treatment in the emergency room and are at least three times more likely to be murdered. Research based on murders is particularly reliable because there is a body so no one can claim she is lying about his abuse. Another problem with these methods is that men and women hit their partners for very different reasons. Men usually do this to maintain control while women assault men in self-defense and out of frustration at his abuse. The researchers do not understand and so make no effort to differentiate the pattern of coercive and controlling behavior; most of which does not involve physical abuse. Perhaps the most important difference is that it is common for women to be so afraid that her partner will kill or seriously injure her that she will give in and do whatever he wants just to protect her safety. This is rarely true of men. This is the essence of domestic violence and no accurate analysis is possible without taking this into consideration. These studies also do not include rape which in heterosexual relationships is something overwhelmingly done by men to women.

One of the fundamental problems both with the abuser rights perspective and of the courts is that they want to treat people and groups the same even though they are very different. There is a long history of husbands being entitled and even encouraged to assault their wives, control them and make the decisions for the family. The first law in the United States about what we would now call domestic violence said that husbands may not beat their wives ON SUNDAY. In other words beating her any other time was acceptable. There was never the equivalent expectation or permission for wives to assault their husbands. Although the laws have changed, this history means there are still many men who feel entitled to control their partners and use abusive tactics to do so. An individual woman might repeatedly assault her male partner but it is not based and supported by beliefs that wives are entitled to control their husbands.

My friend, Molly Dragiewicz wrote an important book, Equality with a Vengeance that includes a ton of good research that disproves the frivolous claims coming from abuser groups. The research is clear that men commit most violent crime both in this country and throughout the world. Well over ninety percent of familicides, crimes in which an individual kills the spouse and children are committed by men. As I write this article there have been more than one hundred mass murders in the year since the Newtown tragedy and all but one were

committed by males.

The research about batterer narratives helps us understand how abusive men can appear so sincere when they confidently repeat their misinformation. Many will say that it is wrong for a man to assault a woman EXCEPT if she does something he defines as improper or she is a (insert the slur). They then view their attack on her as justified and even self-defense. Again there is nothing remotely similar for women.

Mothers Make False Claims

The "fathers' rights" movement and cottage industry that supports abusive fathers are permeated with the belief that most abuse allegations made by mothers are false. This is really based on ideology and assumption because there is no valid research to support it. PAS is based on this assumption. Significantly, the Saunders' study (from the U.S. Department of Justice) found that professionals with inadequate training tended to believe the myth that women frequently make false allegations and unscientific alienation theories. So when their propagandists encourage courts to disbelieve mothers' complaints they are demonstrated their lack of training and qualifications.

Nicholas Bala led one of the leading studies about false allegations in the context of custody and in fact it was a study that looked at many other studies. He found that mothers make deliberately false allegations less than two percent of the time. Any "research" with significantly higher numbers reflects the frequency that true allegations of abuse are disbelieved. Interestingly the Bala study found that fathers involved in contested custody are 16 times more likely than mothers to make deliberately false allegations. The common abuser tactics of claiming alienation and claiming mothers lie about their abuse are examples of these false allegations by abusive fathers. In fairness the Bala study is not saying that all men are this dishonest. The study applies only to contested custody and a large majority of these cases involve abusive fathers who feel entitled to use any tactic including false allegations to regain the control over their partner they believe had no right to leave.

At least 40 states and many districts created court-sponsored gender bias commissions. They found that there is widespread gender bias against women and particular woman litigants. Common examples are that mothers are given less credibility than fathers, are held to a higher standard of proof and blamed for the actions of their abuser. These findings help explain why so many true allegations of abuse are disbelieved by the courts.

Shared Parenting Benefits Children

Shared parenting is another ideological belief of abuser groups that is not supported by valid research and is not beneficial to children. Many of us can remember when shared parenting was either not permitted or strongly discouraged. An initial study based on a small population and short time period found that shared parenting could be beneficial to children under the best of circumstances. This encouraged courts to promote shared parenting as a way to resolve difficult and contentious cases. Abusers have promoted shared parenting as a way for fathers to gain control when they otherwise would have difficulty winning custody because of their abuse and the mother provided most of the children care.

Later research based on a larger population and a longer period of time found that shared parenting is actually harmful to children. Constantly going back and forth is disruptive, having two homes is really having none and needed items are often in the wrong home.

There is legitimate research that shared parenting can benefit children under the best of circumstances. This would include a voluntary desire by both parents to share parenting, an ability of the parents to cooperate and living nearby. There is other good research that found shared parenting is never a good idea for children. Indeed most cases in which shared parenting are initially tried are quickly changed because of the problems it creates. There is no need to reconcile this dispute in the context of contested custody and domestic violence as these cases are not close to the best of circumstances.

Shared parenting laws usually include exceptions for domestic violence, but this does not protect the children when courts have difficulty recognizing true allegations of abuse. The courts are littered with cases in which mothers are pressured to accept shared parenting with their abuser and often severely punished if they object. The Saunders' study found that abusers use decision making authority to control the mother and hurt the children. They use the exchanges to harass the mothers and although contradictory to try to resume the relationship. If the court is not inclined to limit an abuser to supervised visitation, parallel parenting would work far better for the children. Until the courts create the necessary training and reforms to improve its response to domestic violence consideration of shared parenting is a particularly bad idea that causes enormous mischief.

Children Need Both Parents Equally

This statement is effective in misleading people because it sounds so reasonable and fair. It is really based on an ideological belief in treating individuals the same even when they are very different. This approach is designed to treat the mother and father the same REGARDLESS OF PAST PARENTING. This is not in a child's best interests. The truth is that children do not need both parents equally. They need their primary attachment figure more than the other parent and the safe parent more than the abusive one. In domestic violence cases courts should stop pressuring the victim to cooperate with the abuser and instead force the abuser to stop the abuse in order to gain time with the children.

The reach and harm of this misleading statement is illustrated by a statement by one of the leading family court judges in the United Kingdom. In a speech to an abuser rights group he said that the worst thing that can happen to children is for the mother to bad mouth the father. We have heard judges in the United States make similar statements. It is hard to imagine that this is meant literally. I would hope the judge realizes that assaulting, killing or sexually abusing a child and many other abusive actions are far more harmful. The ACES (Adverse Childhood Experiences) studies demonstrate the profound harm to children's health caused by trauma which is not true about negative statements. Indeed some negative statements are beneficial for children to learn. When children see an abusive father mistreat them or their mother it is important for the mother to tell them that such behavior is not acceptable in our society.

The misuse of the belief that mothers should not make negative statements about the father was taken to the extreme in a notorious case in Poughkeepsie, N.Y. The court found the mother to have engaged in alienating behavior because she encouraged the children to eat healthy foods, dress appropriately for the weather and avoid adult oriented television programs. This was considered alienation.

and avoid adult oriented television programs. This was considered alienation because the father encouraged all of these harmful activities. In the world outside of family courts this would just be considered good advice that any parent would be expected to give their children. As a result of widespread gender bias in the courts more serious negative comments by fathers are routinely ignored or minimized.

Mothers Most Often Already Receive Custody

This is a statement we often hear from those supporting abusive fathers. It is literally true, but highly misleading. Over 95% of custody cases are settled more or less amicably. Some involve abusive fathers who love their children enough that they would not deliberately hurt them by separating them from their mothers. Accordingly these cases tend to be settled with the mother giving up economic benefits she and the children deserve in order to retain custody. In the more common cases that do not involve domestic violence the parents work out a truly voluntary arrangement they believe will benefit their children. In this still sexist society, mothers continue to provide most of the child care and loving fathers sacrifice their personal interests for their children to create arrangements where the children live with the mother and spend significant time with the father. This is why mothers receive custody far more than fathers, but it is based on voluntary agreements and not favoritism from the courts.

The problem in the custody court system is the less than 5% of cases that cannot be settled and continue to trial and usually far beyond. Most of these cases involve abusive fathers who seek custody as a tactic to regain control over their victims. These are the most dangerous abusers because they believe the mother has no right to leave them. This is why three-fourths of all women killed by their male partners are killed after they have left. It is why in a recent two year period we found news stories about 175 children murdered by abusive fathers involved in contested custody. More commonly the abusers seek custody as a way to regain control and punish the mothers for leaving. The abusive fathers understand that the best way to hurt a mother is to hurt the children, but the courts routinely just assume the father is seeking custody out of love for the children.

Although contested custody cases overwhelmingly involve true complaints of domestic violence by mothers, most of the time the dangerous abuser receives custody or joint custody. One troubling finding is that abusive fathers are more likely to win custody than safe fathers. The flawed practices, gender bias, and reliance on unqualified professionals, result in 58,000 children being sent for custody or unprotected visitation with dangerous abusers every year. Although mothers rarely make false allegations of abuse, the courts routinely disbelieve or minimize their complaints.

The significance of the Saunders' study is that it explains why the courts so frequently mishandle domestic violence cases and give control to dangerous abusers. Saunders found that we now have substantial scientific research that courts could use to inform their decisions about domestic violence allegations. Unfortunately judges never developed the practice of looking to this research because it was not available when courts were first creating responses to domestic violence. Saunders specifically found that the standard and required training for evaluators, judges and lawyers does not provide them with the specific information needed to respond effectively to domestic violence cases. This is the worst of all possible situations because the training received does not make these professionals qualified to recognize and respond to domestic violence but gives them a false sense of competence so they refuse to consult with genuine experts.

Saunders recommends that evaluators and other professionals receive training in screening for domestic violence, risk assessment, post-separation violence and the impact of domestic violence on children. Most of the evaluators claimed to have training in these subjects, but when tested with vignettes they demonstrated they did not have the needed understanding. Most of the evaluators claimed they screened for domestic violence by using standard psychological tests that tell them nothing about domestic violence. This means they are not screening for domestic violence and routinely disbelieve true allegations because they don't know what to look for. This failing undermines the entire court system because lawyers and judges look to psychologists and other mental health professionals for expertise in cases and training. The misinformation they receive in one case poisons many other cases. After hearing the outdated and discredited claims throughout their careers it becomes deeply ingrained so that many judges and lawyers are resistant to accurate information. It sounds so different from what they constantly hear from the "experts."

Saunders found that evaluators and other professionals without the needed training tend to focus on the myth that mothers frequently make false allegations, unscientific alienation theories and the mistaken assumption that attempts to protect children from dangerous abusers are harmful to the children. These false beliefs lead to outcomes that hurt children.

The problem is compounded by the development of a cottage industry of psychologists and attorneys who make their living promoting approaches biased in favor of abusive fathers. Domestic violence are tactics men use to coerce and control partners. Economic control is a common form of domestic violence and this means that in most contested custody cases (which are really domestic violence cases) the abusive father controls most of the family's resources. Accordingly the best way to earn a large income is to support practices that help abusers. Unfortunately courts do not tend to be skeptical of these biased professionals and in many cases we see courts appoint "fathers' rights" attorneys and psychologists for neutral roles such as GAL and evaluator. Good mothers have no chance to win the support of professionals who are part of the cottage industry.

The Saunders' report found that domestic violence advocates possess exactly the training and expertise needed to help courts on domestic violence cases. They knew more about the specific topics recommended by Saunders than evaluators, judges and lawyers. Nevertheless we repeatedly see courts refuse to listen or minimize the testimony of genuine experts claiming they are biased because "they always oppose domestic violence." The courts also place great weight on academic degrees that provide no domestic violence training. The cottage industry seeks to undermine domestic violence laws while advocates try to support them. And yet it is the advocates who are treated as if they were biased.

The research suggests that a multi-disciplinary approach works best in domestic violence custody cases. Mental health professionals have expertise in psychology and mental illness. Lawyers and judges are experts in the law. Doctors can be used for medical issues and other experts for substance abuse and sexual abuse. Domestic violence advocates are the experts in domestic violence. The Saunders study demonstrated support for a multi-disciplinary approach by favorably citing many of the chapters in my book co-edited with Dr. Mo Therese Hannah.

The findings about inadequate training, flawed and outdated practices and gender bias are incompatible with any view that the courts are responding properly to domestic violence cases much less the abuser fantasy that mothers are favored.

Judges cannot do their job of protecting children while they continue to be burdened by outdated and discredited practices.

Mothers Commit Child Abuse More than Fathers

This is another example of the National Parents Association taking information out of context in order to distort the circumstances. It is true that mothers commit more child abuse and neglect than fathers, but that is because they provide so much more of the child care. If the statistics were adjusted based on the amount of child care provided, it would be clear that fathers are far more dangerous to children. The problem is further compounded by the tendency of child protective agencies to always focus on the mother because moms are easier to find and far more compliant.

Courts Receive Grants to Reform Practices

Those of us who work to protect children from abuse are reminded every day of the enormous pain and ruined lives caused by the failure of the court system to recognize and respond effectively to domestic violence and child abuse allegations. When our book, *Domestic Violence, Abuse and Child Custody* came out, I wrote an article about the ten ways we knew the custody court system was broken. This was based on the frequency of harmful outcomes, denials of true allegations and deeply flawed practices that undermine the ability of courts to get it right.

It seems obvious that what we need to do is meet with court administrators; present the overwhelming research and work together to create the needed reforms. So far the courts have been resistant, if not hostile to considering the adoption of best practices based on new research that was not available when the courts created the present practices. Each time important new research came out whether it was our book, *The Batterer as Parent*, the Saunders' study or the new ACES research; we have hoped that it would create the impetus for courts to discuss the needed reforms.

One problem is that fundamental to our jurisprudence is the doctrine of *res judicata* which requires that once a decision and finding is made, it can no longer be challenged (aside from appeals) and it is assumed to be right. This is an important and valuable principle because otherwise you would have to constantly relitigate the same issues over and over and just imagine what wealthy abusers could do with that. This is working particularly badly in domestic violence cases both because courts frequently fail to recognize true allegations of abuse and often refuse to look at new evidence of the pattern of abuse in the context of the previous evidence that was rejected. Context is critical to understanding domestic violence, but many of the court practices and abuser strategies prevent courts from understanding the facts in context. I have seen many cases in which the court disbelieved allegations of abuse and forced children not only to live with the abuser but to engage in therapy based on that assumption. When new information comes out demonstrating the initial decision was a mistake the professionals believe they must ignore it and silence the children.

In the next volume of *Domestic Violence, Abuse and Child Custody* which we hope to submit to the publisher this month, we have a chapter following up on the 175 children murdered by abusive fathers involved in custody disputes. We asked judges and court administrators in the communities where the tragedies occurred what reforms they had created in response in order to safeguard other children. The judges interviewed were the best and most knowledgeable which is why they agreed to be interviewed. Nevertheless the answer was that they created no reforms because they assumed the murder was an exception. Domestic violence experts recognize the problems in the court because we look at the patterns both within a case and over many cases. The courts seem never to look for patterns and thus have not been open to research that proves the present practices routinely place children at risk.

Some of the judges interviewed said that they regularly participated in meetings that included domestic violence advocates and these experts helped with training judges and other professionals. These are good practices that promote a multi-disciplinary approach and would tend to lead to better results. The problem is that these good practices are rare in the court system.

More common is for courts to rely on the same small group of psychologists and other mental health professionals for expertise in domestic violence cases. They are expert in mental illness and psychology but not domestic violence. Hearing from the same often unqualified experts creates an insularity in the custody courts that contributes to their satisfaction with the failed practices. Other courts, government agencies and civilian organizations look to a much wider group of experts with knowledge of current research. This is why other parts of society respond more effectively to domestic violence and are less likely to repeat the myths that are so prevalent in family court.

So the problem is how do we create a dialogue with court leaders and encourage them to be open to considering how the new research impacts old practices that have been shown to hurt children. This is why the grants to courts in four states is such an encouraging sign and why the National Parents Organization was so aggressive and unreasonable in attacking the Justice Department, Battered Women's Justice Project and the grants to state courts.

The Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) conducted an impressive and lengthy investigation about concerns the custody courts are failing children. Every day I hear stories of children's lives ruined I wish they could have moved more quickly. But I recognize that by doing a thorough job they could make sure their findings are correct and they will not be vulnerable to the unreasoned attacks from abuser groups and the professionals who make their money off the misery of children.

OVW reviewed much of the newest research including the Saunders' study. I know that staffers read our book. They created roundtable discussions with leading experts to present current research and experience. Significantly, the experts they listened to are very different from the mental health professionals relied on by the courts who know little about domestic violence. The courts rarely hear from a professional who would be considered one of the nation's leading experts and indeed in some cases the courts refuse to consider testimony from genuine experts without irrelevant mental health degrees or people they are used to seeing in their courts.

I know something of the process because **I had the honor of being selected as one of the experts to participate in the roundtable discussions. My colleagues on the panel are the very best experts in this nation and provided a wealth of information for OVW to study.** I believe the quality and quantity of research and information made it easy for OVW to make findings that the present practices in custody courts are failing to protect children. I greatly appreciate **my colleagues at the Battered Women's Justice Project**** who are knowledgeable and caring. I often turn to them for research for the books I am working on. I am sure they will do a wonderful job in implementing this grant

project.

[[BWJP is a project under HHS grantee, nonprofit Minnesota Program Development Inc., now dba? Domestic Abuse Intervention Programs ["the Duluth Model"]. Ellen Pence, et. al. I blogged it in June 2011 look at their tax returns! AFCC (who this crowd never mentions by name) allows BWJP to present at their conferences and now considers them "Partners." AFCC promotes parental alienation and its founders helped set up the courts to start with. I think that's actually historically relevant information, but I guess CPPA and friends just would rather talk about victims and trauma]]

The four states are being asked to create models for responding to domestic violence cases based on current scientific research and the widespread problems caused by the present flawed approaches. It is extremely valuable to include court systems in the process of creating needed reforms. Inevitably the new practices tried in these four states will work far better than what we have now. Coming from state court systems, other courts will be more open to adopting these reforms. Accordingly this is an encouraging development and one we hope will lead all courts to finally make the safety of children the first priority.

[[Where is the link? Oh, I forgot -- we are supposed to wait for **the hearsay anecdotal summary version of the studies** (even though WHO funded them? the public -- can we get an OVW grant number, maybe? Or a link to find one? Nope -- just sit back and listen to the summaries from a disbarred lawyer, who hasn't yet reported on the **Viola Stroud (Supervised Visitation Provider in Shockome case)** who was already charged with (fraud, or grand larceny) and/or how it was pulled off, which might be a clue to how to stop it next time around...]]

I am deeply grateful for the work of the staff at OVW, the National Institute of Justice, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, the Battered Women's Justice Project and the experts and victims who participated in the discussions that led to this potential breakthrough. They deserve praise and encouragement because work to prevent domestic violence and child abuse must never again be viewed as an attack on fathers. Good men and good fathers want all children to live in a world without trauma. I hope that this project will be an important step in bringing the custody courts into a coalition of people and organizations working together to prevent domestic violence and child abuse. Ending domestic violence is not a biased position---IT'S THE LAW.

Barry Goldstein is a nationally recognized domestic violence expert, speaker, writer and consultant. He is the co-editor with Mo Therese Hannah of DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, ABUSE and CHILD CUSTODY. Representing the Domestic Violence Survivor, co-authored with Elizabeth Liu is designed to train attorneys to present domestic violence cases and was released in April of 2013. Barry can be reached by email at Barryg78@aol.com

For more information about the new book, including access to the first approximately 50 pages or to purchase the book go to the publisher's web site at <http://civresearchinstitute.com/rdv.html> Elizabeth Liu and I have convinced our publisher to make available the last section of our chapter about GALs that lists and explains the best practices for GALs in domestic violence cases. You can now download and print this information and share it with your GAL. Everyone is welcome to share this information. I also hope you will check out **my new Face book page, Barry Goldsteins Representing the Domestic Violence Survivor**. Barry's web site, www.Barrygoldstein.net is back up and running with new material.

Connie Valentine
CA Protective Parents Association

*[COMMENTARY *notes on formatting of this PDF printout. Any red emphases are mine, not CPPAs; any green are my commentary. I was unable to insert a proper (Page # of #) header onto this format, or the contents into a normal text doc't either. This email (type, and contents, style, etc.) if for me an example of HOW advocacy groups seek to become the news-source, while censoring major topics relevant to the courts, encouraging support of their causes, and DIScouraging conflicting sources of information, OR tools/ways to fact-check the personnel and groups named above.*

Their central approach and message hasn't changed since BEFORE I (hearing this material) saw my children stolen overnight many years ago. I have to seriously consider whether someone has paid off some of the participants to distract and derail others from "the money trail" and a better account of the operating systems of the court, some of which was already blogged (incl. from California) as early as 1999, 2002 etc. I began in 2009.

In 2011 (at least) blogger, now journalist Anne Stevenson also began accumulating evidence and naming the participating organizations. She is currently working in Connecticut -- another recent email alert from CPPA mentioned a group in CT -- but NOT her published articles in: Huffington Post, or Washington Times Communities where I believe she is now staff.

*Li: Richards (NAFCJ.net) since 1993 (DC area, Virginia) and a related California woman also involved and knowledgeable about the fatherhood FUNDING (not just "fathers' rights groups"), Cindy Ross, have had DIRECT contact with at least CPPA and CJE personnel, who unilaterally rejected their information, and assessments of the issues in the court. Karen Anderson (at least at one time a participant/leader of CPPA, and whose name it's incorporated in, last I looked) reported Grants Misappropriation in her own case as early as 1999 (posted at johnnyumphandle.com. Some people never change, however this level of "SILENCE" on major issues could be viewed as "killing others with kindness," or in short, **cull-like behavior, from top to bottom.** [this is otherwise an email alert rec'd 3 Feb. 2014]*

Tax, IRS, Corp. lookups on Stop Abuse Campaign:

his one had two simultaneous "domestic" registrations (FL, NYC-Harlem sharing one EIN#-203931272), and is, besides spanning about 5 states in all, at different points, is a very strange group to bring on board; it is on my agenda to blog. Why them (it's a small group) and why now, comes to mind.

ORGANIZATION NAME	STATE	YEAR	FORM	PAGES	TOTAL ASSETS	DOB
Stop Abuse Campaign Corporation	FL	2011	990EZ	9	\$2,001	-20-3931272
Breaktheabusecyclecom Corp.	FL	2010	990EZ	10	\$53	-20-3931272
Stop Abuse Campaign Corporation	FL	2010	990EZ	10	\$141	-20-3931272

The sole nonprofit purpose is to maintain a website "to educate and prevent child abuse," and

Inc. as "BreaktheabuseCycle.com CORP." in FL on 11/12/2009.

Meanwhile, per NYDiv of Corporations, on 8/23/2010, mail being accepted at a certain Broadway address, I think it's in the garment district (1410 N. Broadway #302), Stop Abuse Campaign INC. is formed as a "domestic nonprofit" with NO registered agent.

Brad Itzkowitz: Namechange 2/25/2011 to Stop Abuse Campaign **CORP.**, and Andrew Willis from NY, NY (Harlem address) added as CEO (there being two CEOs), Itzkowitz then lived in PA, but it was still a FL corp.

Their 2011 Tax Return (above) shows they spent about \$14K on the tax-exempt purpose (having received a \$15K loan) about \$7K went to Andrew Willis' salary.

@ Jan 2014 (less than a week before THIS email CPPA alert of 1/8/2014 which leads with "Stop Abuse Campaign,") it shows as a FL corp with no FL Director -- 3 Directors in the one Harlem apt., and Itzkowitz is in PA, but the group's mailing address is in New Jersey (?).

From the website (primary colors, tweets, social media, etc.) this appears to be a straight promotion of the Crisis in the Courts crowd, including Vince Fellini and the ACES study, and Daniel Saunders UMichigan and Barry Goldstein:
<http://stopabusecampaign.com/feature/protect-children>



Daniel Saunders, professor of social work, University of Michigan, established one of the first intervention programs for men who batter and helped to establish crisis and advocacy programs for battered women in the 1970s

The "Donate" page says, send money to the New York (apt.2) address. Neither "Stop Abuse Campaign" nor that EIN# shows up on a search at the NYState Attorney General's "nys.chartersregistry.com" as registered IN New York.

However, as far as the IRS is concerned, it shows as NY [NOT "FL"] tax-exempt (501(c)3):
20-3931272 Stop Abuse Campaign Corp New York NY U.S. PC
 however, on the same search site (IRS Exempt Organizations Select Check) when clicked on

'Has Filed a Form 990-N, using only the EIN#, we found the Florida Organization (under its old name):

EIN ▲	Legal Name (Doing Business As)	City ▲	State ▲	ZIP/ ▲	Country ▲	Tax Year ▲
20-3931272	BREAKTHEABUSECYCLE.COM	Boynton Beach	FL	33437	United States	2009

[Tax year 2009]

Brad Itzkowitz March 2010 "iCNN" letter to Pope Benedict XVI [respectful enough, sensible, and yes he is a survivor]