Collective Memo of Concern to: World Health Organization

RE: Inclusion of “Parental Alienation” as a “Caregiver-child relationship problem” Code QE52.0 in the International Classification of Diseases 11th Revision (ICD-11)

From: Concerned Family Law Academics, Family Violence Experts, Family Violence Research Institutes, Child Development and Child Abuse Experts, Children’s Rights Networks and Associations1

Date: April 22, 2019

It has recently come to our collective attention that the World Health Organization is considering the addition of “parental alienation” (PA) as a “caregiver-child relationship problem” in ICD-11, the International Classification of Diseases 11th Revision. We are surprised by the lack of prior consultation in connection with gender equality issues associated with the concept and are deeply concerned about this proposal from a women’s safety and child development, health and safety point of view, as well as from research and science perspectives.

We are requesting removal of all references to “parental alienation” and related concepts in ICD-11 for the reasons set out below. Our research and experience in court has demonstrated that parental alienation, which lacks credibility, is frequently employed to divert attention from domestic violence and abuse and other evidence relevant to the best interests of the child.

Empirically verified problems associated with the application of parental alienation theory, discussed in Part Two, include:

- Limited support for the concept in scientific research on children
- Gender bias in the application and effects of parental alienation claims
- Deflection of attention from scrutiny of parenting practices and parent-child relationships in favor of assuming primary-care parental blame when children have poor relationships with the other parent
- Deflection of attention from scrutiny of child risk and safety factors in family violence cases
- Imposition of equal time, joint custody presumptions or equal shared parental responsibility
- Deflection of attention from thorough analysis of the best interests of children criteria
- The silencing of women and children such that evidence of family violence and of negative parenting is not presented

1 Linda C Neilson, Professor Emerita, University of New Brunswick, Canada, and Research Fellow of the Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre for Family Violence Research composed this memo with the support and assistance of Joan Meier, Professor of Law, George Washington University Law School and Legal Director, Domestic Violence Legal Empowerment and Appeals Project (DV LEAP); Elizabeth Sheehy, Professor Emerita, F.R.S.C., O.O., University of Ottawa, Faculty of Law; Margaret Jackson, Professor Emerita, Director of the FREDA Centre on Violence Against Women and Children; Prof. Ruth Halperin-Kaddari, Professor at Bar-Ilan University Faculty of Law, Israel, Founding Head of the Rackman Center for the Advancement of Women at BIU and former Vice-Chair of CEDAW; Susan Boyd, Professor Emerita F.R.S.C., Peter A. Allard School of Law, University of British Columbia; Peter Jaffe, PhD, Psychologist & Professor, Academic Director, Center for Research and Education on Violence Against Women and Children, Western University, London ON, Canada; and Simon Lapierre, Full Professor, School of Social Work, University of Ottawa.
The discounting of the perspectives of children and the failure to protect children from parental abuse, contrary to the internationally recognized rights of children set out in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child

- Inappropriate assignment of parental blame for normal adolescent behavior
- Deflection of attention from studies that demonstrate child resistance to contact and child harm are better explained by factors other than those proposed by parental alienation theory
- Emerging evidence that parental alienation “remedies” are harming many children
- Negative effect of the theory on evidence and on legal responsibilities to assess children’s best interests and safety
- The undermining of knowledge about how family violence harms children and what is needed for their safety and well-being.

PART TWO: Discussion

The parental alienation concept is not supported by credible scientific research on children.

Discussion: As the Amici brief to the Court of Appeals for the State of New York (March 22, 2019) associated with E.V. (Anonymous) v R.V. (Anonymous) and G.V. (Anonymous) Westchester Country Clerk’s Index No. 10602/2007, states:

Parental alienation, while lacking a universal clinical or scientific definition, generally refers to the presumption that a child’s fear or rejection of one parent (typically the non-custodial parent), stems from the malevolent influence of the preferred (typically custodial) parent. The alienation hypothesis inherently relies on two flawed assumptions: (i) that children do not ordinarily fear or resist a non-custodial parent without manipulation by the other parent, and (ii) that a child’s hostility toward or fear of the other parent, can in fact be caused solely by the favored parent’s negative influence (or programming), regardless of the child’s own experience. There is little or no scientific support for either premise, and both derive from PAS, which has itself been roundly debunked by scientific and professional authorities.²

Vigorous debate and controversy surround the validity of “parental alienation” “diagnoses” and the assessment tools and remedies associated with it.³ While some authors contend that the concept has

---

² PAS stands for Parental Alienation Syndrome, a controversial concept proposed by child psychiatrist Richard A. Gardner that resulted in family courts removing numerous children from the primary care of protective mothers. The concept was soundly refuted on grounds of gender bias, harm to children, and lack of scientific credibility in the mid-1980s. It then fell into disuse. The same concept resurfaced in the mid-2000s largely as a result of Dr. Amy J. L. Baker’s interviews in the United States with forty adults who responded to an advertisement, who claimed to have been alienated from a parent when they were children. Blatant anti-women and children terminology found in Gardner’s earlier work has been removed (although gender bias and the undermining of the views of children have remained) and the word “syndrome” was omitted, presumably in order to avoid the need for scientific proof of a mental health condition. Despite questionable research foundations, the concept spread rapidly and is now being applied in many parts of the world.

demonstrated scientific validity, many tenured academic researchers, child experts and experts in the domestic and family violence fields disagree. References to published criticisms of parental alienation theory by internationally respected experts are listed in footnote 5. It is important to note that many of the assertions of validity have been advanced by individuals who offer or have offered alienation “reunification therapy” for economic gain or who are expert witnesses paid to testify in custody cases.

Concerns about parental alienation theory that have been validated empirically by researchers who do not have vested economic or personal interests in parental alienation remedie, include:

- 1) Concerns about research credibility, limited evidence of representativeness of study samples, small sample sizes, absence of longitudinal research, and most importantly, lack of


For example, Richard A. Warshak, formerly associated with Family Bridges workshops in the United States; Amy J. Baker; Stanley Clawar, clinical sociologist, and owner of Walden Counselling & Therapy; Barbara Jo Fidler of Families Moving Forward.


research controls to assess for and rule out alternative explanations for child resistance to contact and child harm that are known to have a negative impact on children's relationships with parents and that have been documented repeatedly in research on child well-being for decades, i.e., parental conflict, intimate partner and family violence, child abuse, weak parent-child attachment, parental neglect, parental substance misuse and/or negative or hostile parenting;  

- 2) Gender bias in the application and effects of parental alienation claims;  
- 3) Deflection of attention from scrutiny of parenting practices and parent-child relationships in favor of projecting blame onto primary-care parents when children have poor relationships with the other parent;  

alienation theory. The claim is made that Clawar and Rivlin’s empirical research documenting parental alienation and its associated child and parental behaviors is based on analysis of more than 700 (now 1000) cases. However, scrutiny of the empirical basis for the claims made by Clawar and Rivlin, supra note 4, “Appendix: Research Techniques and Sample Characteristics,” reveals that the Clawar and Rivlin analysis is derived from client files seen in their professional practice and subsequently analyzed by the authors. In the absence of research samples and research controls, we have no way of knowing the degree to which the authors’ conclusions can be extended beyond clinical samples to the general public, and we have no way of knowing the extent to which the authors considered and controlled for scientifically verified and professionally accepted adversities that affect children’s relationships with their parents. Clawar and Rivlin’s conclusions should be considered therapeutic theory drawn from clinical practice rather than scientific research.

9 Jean Mercer, “Are intensive parental alienation treatments effective and safe for children and adolescents?” (2019) Journal of Child Custody https://doi.org/10.1080/15379418.2018.1557578. Although Dr. Amy Baker has testified in Canadian courts, for example, Hukerby v. Paquet [2014] S.J. no 791, that her research is longitudinal, and other parental alienation advocates have advised courts that Dr. Baker’s conclusions are based on “long-term” research.” In fact, her research was actually merely qualitative and retrospective. For particulars, see: Amy J. L. Baker, “The Long-Term Effects of Parental Alienation on Adult Children: A Qualitative Research Study” (2006) 33:4 American Journal of Family Therapy 289; Amy J. L. Baker, Adult Children of parental alienation syndrome: Breaking the ties that bind (New York: W.W. Norton Professional, 2007). In contrast, a longitudinal study is a research design that involves repetitive observations and assessments of the same variables over a period of time. For example, a longitudinal study of parental alienation would start with use of a validated instrument (of which there are none) to identify a sample of children who were alienated from a parent. It would then follow and reassess the children at various points throughout their lives in comparison with children who were not alienated from a parent. Well-designed longitudinal studies implement experimental controls in order to distinguish the effects of parental alienation from the effects of other adversities on children. Dr. Baker’s parental alienation research is retrospective, based on adult memory of childhood experiences and lacking in research controls. Indeed a small longitudinal study of cases in which children resisted parental contact reveals that negative outcomes for children, when they exist in these cases, can be explained by serious deficits on the part of parents the children reject: Janet Johnson & Judith Goldman, “Outcomes of Family Counselling Interventions With Children Who Resist Visitation: An addendum to Friedlander and Walters” (2010) 48:1 Family Court Review 112.

10 Without research controls it is impossible to distinguish the influence of parental alienation from the influence of other factors. Scott Huff, “Expanding the Relationship between Parental Alienating Behaviors and Children’s Contact Refusal Following Divorce: Testing Additional Factors and Long-Term Outcomes” (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut, 2015).


12 Milchman, ibid; Nancy Erickson, “Fighting False Allegations of Parental Alienation Raised as Defenses to Valid Claims of Abuse” (2013) 6:1 Family & Intimate Partner Violence Quarterly 35; Meier & Dickson, supra note 5;
• 4) Deflection of attention from scrutiny of child risk and safety factors, particularly in family violence cases;¹³
• 5) Imposition of equal time, joint custody, and co-parenting assumptions by parental alienation advocates;¹⁴
• 6) Deflection of attention away from thorough analysis of the best interests of children criteria in the legal system;¹⁵
• 7) The silencing of women and children such that evidence of family violence and of negative parenting is not presented to courts¹⁶
• 8) The discounting of the perspectives of children and the non-protection of children from parental abuse, contrary to the internationally recognized rights of children set out in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child;¹⁷ and
• 9) The inappropriate assignment of parental blame for behaviors of adolescents that are normal and consistent with the needs of youth at an adolescent stage of development.¹⁸

Family violence and child welfare associations in many parts of the world have become increasingly concerned about misuse of parental alienation concepts to the detriment of women and children.

Child resistance to contact and child harm are better explained by factors other than those proposed by parental alienation theory

Discussion: Scrutiny of emerging arm’s length research utilizing research controls and credible research methods reveals that the premises of parental alienation enthusiasts do not stand up to research scrutiny. Instead, it becomes clear that factors long identified in child-welfare and development research, such as lack of parental warmth, exposure to parental or family violence and/or parental conflict, offer far better explanations for child resistance to contact than does parental alienation theory.


¹⁴ Bruch, supra note 3; Joyanna Silberg et al., Crisis in Family Court: Lessons From Turned Around Cases (2013); Neilson (2018), supra note 3; Smith, supra note 3; Milchman, supra note 11; Meier & Dickson, supra note 5; Erickson, supra note 5; Suzanne Zaccour, “Parental Alienation in Quebec Custody Litigation” (2018) 59 Cahiers de droit 1072; Winstock, supra note 12; Zoe Rathus, “Mapping the Use of Social Science in Australian Courts: The example of family law children’s cases” (2016) 25:3 Griffith Law Review 352.

¹⁵ Bruch, supra note 3; Neilson (2018), supra note 3; Smith, supra note 3; Meier & Dickson, supra note 5; Erickson, supra note 12; Pamela Cross, Alienating children or protecting them? (online at Pamela Cross.ca, 2018)).


In fact, these long-documented factors\(^\text{19}\) often operate in opposition to the premises of parental alienation theory. Dr. Scott Huff reports, in his 2015 doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut:

*These findings are notable in that alienating behaviors were not predictors of outcomes in any of the analyses, contrary to previous work on parental alienating behaviors (Baker & Verochio, 2012; Bena-Ami & Baker, 2012).*\(^\text{20}\)

Similarly, Jenna Rowen, who studied the effects on children of parents denigrating the other parent, and Robert Emery have found that denigration patterns and the effects on children were consistent with conflict theory – we have long known that parental conflict is harmful to children – and not with parental alienation theory. Denigration problems were seldom one-sided or linear. Denigration alone seldom resulted in the successful manipulation of a child against the other parent. Instead, denigration usually had the opposite effect of impairing the child’s relationship with the parent engaging in denigration.\(^\text{21}\)

In other words, the child relevant factors verified by significant bodies of research – family violence, parental conflict, absence of parent-child warmth, weak parent-child attachment, parental neglect, negative parenting – that are known to be associated with children’s resistance to parental contact are both different from and more complex than the alienation theory’s primary focus on blaming the preferred parent. Yet, as Jean Mercer has documented, parental alienation advocates ask us to ignore these plausible explanations in favor of adopting a simplistic, one dimensional, speculative view of parent-child relationships that ignores most of the scientifically verified parent-child relationship factors.\(^\text{22}\)

**Parental alienation remedies are harming some children.**

**Discussion:** Parental alienation experts typically recommend that children be removed from preferred parents without any contact while children undergo “reunification therapy” for a substantial period of time to restore or build positive relationships with the parent the children rejected. Stephanie Dallam and Joyanna Silberg, of the Leadership Council on Child Abuse and Interpersonal Violence, report that the treatments recommended by parental alienation therapists are likely to cause children foreseeable and lasting psychological harm, particularly when children have already been traumatized by negative family experiences.\(^\text{23}\) Indeed, removing children from preferred primary-care parents is contrary to research on child resilience, recovery from trauma and accepted child development principles.\(^\text{24}\) While reunification programs may help children in some cases, for example when the parent who engaged in domestic violence has undermined the child’s relationship with the abused parent in order to retain coercive control over the family (a common phenomenon in domestic violence cases), we actually know very little about the short or long-term effects on children, positive or negative, of reunification therapy. While positive claims have been advanced by those who are, or have been, associated with and

---

\(^{19}\) See, for example, L. Neilson, “Spousal Abuse, Children and the Courts: The Case for Social Rather than Legal Change” (1997) 12:1 Canadian Journal of Law and Society 101, in connection with the large number of consistent research studies documenting the negative impact of parental conflict on children.


\(^{22}\) Mercer, *supra* note 9.

\(^{23}\) Stephanie Dallam & Joyanna Silberg, “Recommended treatments for ‘parental alienation syndrome’ (PAS) may cause children foreseeable and lasting psychological harm” (2016) 2-3 Journal of Child Custody 134.

\(^{24}\) Center on the Developing Child, Harvard University, [Resilience](#).
financially benefited from the delivery of such programs, arm’s length, controlled experimental research is lacking. We do not know much, if anything, about the impact of the removal of children from their preferred parent and engagement in “reunification” attempts; about the effects on children’s relationships with preferred parents, siblings and other family members; or about the impact on children’s overall health and well-being. Moreover, anecdotal news reports are emerging now from children old enough to comment on experiences in reunification programs without risk of being censored or disciplined by the legal system. These children report having been forced to attend these programs; being threatened and intimidated; loss of contact with preferred parents, siblings and family members; being exposed to pro-father, anti-mother rhetoric; not being listened to and having their views treated respectfully; and not being protected from parental abuse. Although much of the emerging evidence from children is anecdotal and case specific, such that it is possible that other children had favorable experiences, the emerging experiences of children suggest the need for caution. We need to know a great deal more about the circumstances in which children are helped or harmed by such programs. Until the positive effects of reunification therapy are confirmed by arm’s length, longitudinal research, the current evidence does not support court-imposed reunification programs.

Judges are not mental health experts. Inclusion of parental alienation in the diagnostic manual will result in courts not appreciating the need to assess the scientific validity of the concept when assessing admissibility and will lead to simplified and erroneous assumptions about the appropriateness of proposed remedies. Children will be harmed.

The parental alienation concept has a negative effect on evidence and on legal responsibilities to assess children’s best interests and safety:

Discussion: Inclusion in the diagnostic manual would be detrimental to best interests of the child determinations in the legal system and contrary to the educational efforts of judicial educators. The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges in the United States warns against application of parental alienation theory in family law cases, particularly in cases involving allegations of family violence:

The discredited ‘diagnosis’ of “PAS” (or allegation of “parental alienation”), quite apart from its scientific invalidity, inappropriately asks the court to assume that the children’s behaviors and attitudes toward the parent who claims to be alienated have no grounding in reality. It also diverts attention away from the behaviors of the [disliked] parent, who may

---

26 Mercer, supra note 9.
28 Nguyen, ibid.
29 Doughty et al. (2018a), supra note 3; Doughty et al. (2018b), supra note 3; Dallam & Silberg, supra note 23.
have directly influenced the children's responses by acting in violent, disrespectful, intimidating, humiliating and/or discrediting ways towards the children themselves, or the children's other parent.

Analysis of “expert” parental alienation testimony in family law cases in Canada reveals that parental alienation “experts” testifying in Canadian courts are advising courts to ignore: the views of children; evidence of child well-being while in the care of the child’s preferred parent; evidence of negative parenting on the part of the alienation claimant; and evidence of children’s therapists in favor of adopting parental alienation theory and denying children contact with the parent they prefer in order to restore or create a relationship with the parent the children reject.31 Case law in Canada and the United States is documenting children being forcefully removed by police from the homes of primary-care parents children prefer, sometimes repeatedly, and placed with parents the children fear or reject.32 In a number of Canadian cases children have applied to be removed from parental authority entirely in order to escape parenting arrangements imposed on them by courts.33

Similarly, American researcher Joan Meier and colleagues, reporting on a major study of parental alienation cases in the United States, and Suzanne Zaccour in Canada, have found that alienation claims are resulting in evidence of paternal abuse of women and children being ignored by courts, in the removal of children from parents (primarily mothers) who seek to protect them, and in children’s placement with abusive parents, even in cases where judges made positive findings of family violence and abuse.34 Indeed Meier and colleagues report that women who present evidence of child abuse are more apt to lose custody of their children than women who merely report intimate partner violence, and that cross-claims of parental alienation virtually double the rate of mothers’ custody losses.35 Joyanna Silberg et al., also reporting from the United States, examined legal cases in which family violence and child abuse claims were initially considered false (as a result of misplaced judicial scepticism36 and/or the impact of alienation claims) but ultimately resulted in findings of abuse and in the return of children to protective parents. The authors report, on the basis of scrutiny of the case law, that when courts placed children with abusive parents the abuse continued, and a third of these children attempted suicide. When courts subsequently made positive findings of abuse and returned children to the custody of protective parents, the children had spent an average of three years in abusive parents’ care.37 Experts in many countries are now documenting concerns about the well-being of children and children’s relationships with abused parents in cases when alienation theory is applied by courts.

**Child research clearly documents the negative impact of family violence on children and on post separation parenting and the need to listen carefully and respectfully to the views of children**

**Discussion:** We know, from a consistent body of research over decades, that family violence against children's caregivers in children's homes causes direct, scientifically documented child stress and harm. The violence need not be witnessed directly in order to cause harm. Some of these children will

31 Neilson (2018), supra note 3.
32 Meier & Dickson, supra note 5; Neilson (2018) supra note 3; Silberg et al., supra note 14.
33 Neilson (2018), supra note 3.
34 Meier & Dickson, supra note 5; Zaccour, supra note 14.
35 Ibid.
36 In connection with judicial and legal scepticism and the reasons for such scepticism throughout the legal system, refer to Deborah Epstein & Lisa Goodman, “Discounting Credibility: Doubting the Testimony and Dismissing the Experiences of Domestic Violence Survivors and Other Women” (2018) 167 U. Penn. L. Rev. forthcoming.
37 Silberg et al., supra note 14.
experience long term fear responses and emotional --even developmental-- harm.\textsuperscript{38} Documentation of direct harm to children from violence directed against adult caregivers is consistent across research methods (qualitative and quantitative) and even across disciplines (social science, medicine, psychiatry, child development, neurobiology).\textsuperscript{39} The research also tells us that perpetrating abuse against mothers commonly occurs together with abuse and violence directed at children\textsuperscript{40} and that child disclosure rates are low.\textsuperscript{41} The post separation parenting patterns research from many countries also tells us that negative perpetrator parenting -- such as demeaning domination, monitoring and surveillance, isolation, excessive physical discipline, and coercive control -- continues and often gets worse following parental separation, once the abused parent is no longer able to shield or buffer the children -- that is, after the adults separate,\textsuperscript{42} if the perpetrator has unsupervised access to the children.

Nonetheless, those family lawyers, mediators, evaluators and judges who do not understand that parental intimate partner violence is directly associated with child harm and child abuse\textsuperscript{43} are silencing


\textsuperscript{39} Refer, for example, to the lengthy list of references on this issue in “Supplementary Reference Bibliography: Effects of Domestic Violence on Children”, \textit{Responding to Domestic Violence in Family Law, Civil Protection and Child Protection Cases} (Ottawa: CanLII, 2017).


women and are failing to investigate and consider women and children’s concerns about parenting and safety in favor of punishing parents – primarily mothers -- (and children) when children resist contact with the other parent. Children are being forcibly removed from the parents they prefer and are being forced into homes and parenting relationships they resist (on the basis that the mother did not sufficiently strongly insist on the child’s relationship with the other parent). Children are running away. Some attempt suicide; others are killed. Researchers are currently documenting the contributing role of family courts in child deaths as a result of family court orders mandating children into unsupervised contact with abusive fathers.

When we turn to children for guidance, we find that children are telling researchers to ask family courts and those associated with family courts to listen and consider more respectfully children’s views on contact with perpetrators of family violence (some children desire contact, others do not) and to pay more attention to children’s concerns about their own and their siblings’ safety. Children are also asking researchers to ask family courts to hold perpetrators of domestic and family violence accountable for harm done to the family and to ensure that perpetrators accept responsibility, apologize and make amends prior to insisting on parenting rights.


[45] Ibid.


In Conclusion: There is far more support for identifying intimate and family violence as a parent-child relationship problem than for identifying "parental alienation" as a parent-child relationship problem.

Indeed, the inclusion of "parental alienation" anywhere in the ICD-11 diagnostic manual is likely to strengthen existing destructive trends in family courts that are causing children and their primary caregivers harm. In addition, empirically validated concerns about the concept's lack of reliability could call into question the scientific credibility of the World Health Organization as well as the reliability of the *International Classification of Diseases*.

The following experts and organizations endorse this memo and seek removal of references to “parental alienation” and related concepts from the ICD-11, *International Classification of Diseases*.

**AUSTRALIA**

Experts:

1. Moo Baulch, CEO, Domestic Violence NSW, Sydney, Australia
2. Dr Karen Crawley, Senior Lecturer, Griffith Law School, Brisbane, Australia
3. Professor Heather Douglas, Law School, the University of Queensland, Australia
4. Dr Molly Dragiewicz, Associate Professor, School of Justice, Faculty of Law, Queensland University of Technology
5. Professor Patricia Easteal, AM, PhD, Consultant, Legal Lightbulbs, Australia
6. Belinda Fehlberg, Professor of Law, Melbourne Law School
7. Dr Michelle Fernando, Senior Lecturer, School of Law, University of South Australia, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia
8. Dr Samantha Jeffries, Senior Lecturer, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia
9. Cathy Humphreys, Head of Department, Professor of Social Work, University of Melbourne
10. Janet Loughman, Principal Solicitor, Women’s Legal Service New South Wales, Australia
11. Professor Elena Marchetti, Griffith Law School, Brisbane, Australia
12. Elspeth McInnes AM, Associate Professor of Sociology in Education, Chair Human Research Ethics Committee, School of Education Magill, University of South Australia
13. Dr Helena Menih, PhD, Lecturer in Criminology, School of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, University of New England, Armidale NSW 2, Australia
14. Associate Professor Silke Meyer, Associate Professor in Criminology, Monash Gender and Family Violence Prevention Centre, Monash University. Melbourne, Australia
15. Associate Professor Carolyn Quadrio, Consultant Child & Family & Forensic Psychiatrist, School of Psychiatry University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
16. Zoe Rathus, Senior Lecturer, Griffith Law School, Brisbane, Australia
17. Joanne Stagg, Lecturer, Griffith Law School, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Australia.
18. Professor Julie Stubbs, UNSW LAW, Co-Director, Centre for Crime, Law & Justice, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
19. Professor Lisa Young, Associate Dean Research, Murdoch School of Law, Perth, Australia

CANADA

Experts:
21. Carol Barkwell, Executive Director, Luke’s Place, Support and Resource Centre for Women and Children in Durham Region, Ontario
22. Suki Beavers, Project Director/directrice de projet, NAWL/ANFD, Ottawa, Ontario
23. Isabelle Boisclair, Professor, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Canada
24. Gabrielle Bouchard, President, Fédération des femmes du Québec
25. Mélissa Blais, professeure associée, Institut de recherches et d’études féministes, Université du Québec à Montréal, Canada
26. Susan Boyd, F.R.S.C., Professor Emerita, Peter A. Allard School of Law, University of British Columbia;
28. Ksenia Burobina, PhD Candidate in Sociology, Université de Montréal, Canada
29. Dr Isabelle Côté, Ph.D., Professeure adjointe, École de service social, Université Laurentienne, Bureau SE 103E
30. Pamela Cross, Family Lawyer and Legal Director, Luke’s Place, Ontario
31. Dr Dominique Damant, Ph.D, Associate Professor, School of Social Work, Université de Montréal, Canada
32. Anick Desrosiers, doctoral student in social work, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada.
33. Dr Francis Dupuis-Déri, Professor, Political Sciences, Université du Québec à Montréal, Canada
34. Jo-Anne Dusel, Executive Director, Provincial Association of Transitions Houses and Services of Saskatchewan (PATHS)
35. Dr Catherine Flynn, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Human and Social Sciences, Université du Québec à Chicoutimi, Canada
36. Michèle Frenette, PhD Student, University of Ottawa, Canada
37. Crystal Giesbrecht, Director of Research and Communications, Provincial Association of Transitions Houses and Services of Saskatchewan (PATHS)
38. Kasari Govender, Executive Director & Lawyer, West Coast LEAF, Vancouver, British Columbia
39. Kim Hawkins, Executive Director, Rise Women’s Legal Centre, Vancouver
40. Dr Catherine Holtmann, Ph.D., Director, Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre for Family Violence Research, Associate Professor, Sociology, University of New Brunswick
41. Dr Margaret Jackson, PhD, Professor Emerita, Director of the FREDA Centre on Violence Against Women and Children
42. Rachel Jacques-Mignault, lawyer, Montreal, Canada
43. Dr Peter Jaffe, PhD, Psychologist & Professor, Academic Director, Center for Research and Education on Violence Against Women and Children, Western University, London ON, Canada
44. Dr Darlene Juschka, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Gender, Religion, and Critical Studies and RESOLVE Alberta
45. Patrick Ladouceur, PhD Student, University of Ottawa, Canada.
46. Dr Michele Landsberg, LLD (Hons), Canadian journalist and author, member of the Order of Canada
47. Dr Simon Lapierre, Full Professor, School of Social Work, University of Ottawa
48. Dr Geneviève Lessard, Ph.D., Professeure titulaire, École de travail social et de criminologie, Université Laval (Québec, Canada), Directrice du Centre de recherche interdisciplinaire sur la violence familiale et la violence faite aux femmes
49. Dr Nicole Letourneau, RN, PhD, FCAHS, ACHF Chair in Parent-Infant Mental Health, Resolve Alberta Director & Principal Investigator, Child Studies Program, Calgary
50. Kendra Nixon, Associate Professor of Social Work, Director of RESOLVE Manitoba, University of Manitoba
51. Dr Linda C Neilson, LLB, Ph.D (Law, L.S.E.), Professor Emerita, University of New Brunswick Canada and Research Fellow of the Muriel McQueen Fergusson Centre for Family Violence
52. Kendra Nixon, Resolve, Manitoba, Provincial Association of Transitions Houses and Services of Saskatchewan (PATHS)

53. Danya O’Malley, Executive Director, PEI Family Violence Prevention Services, Charlottetown, PEI

54. Elizabeth Pickett, Canadian Feminist Network, Ottawa

55. Marie Josèphe Pigeon, general director of SEP – Service d’Entraide Passerelle, Montreal, Canada

56. Sandrine Ricci, Doctoral candidate and lecturer, University of Québec in Montréal (UQAM)

57. Dr Elizabeth Sheehy, LLB, LLM, LLD (hons), Professor Emerita, University of Ottawa, Faculty of Law, F.R.S.C., Order of Ontario

58. Dr Deborah Sinclair, MSW, RSW, PhD, Therapist & Consultant, Lecturer, Factor-Inwentash, Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto, Canada

59. Kharoll-Ann Souffrant, travailleuse sociale et candidate à la maîtrise en service social avec option en études féministes à l’université McGill

60. Dinaïg Stall, Professor, University of Québec in Montréal, Montreal, Canada

It is important to note that there were Directors of the Canadian Family Violence Research Centres (including one past Director) who have endorsed this memo.

Institutions:

61. Fédération des femmes du Québec

62. Fédération des maisons d’hébergement pour femmes, Québec, Canada

63. Feminist Anti-Violence (FemAnVi) Research Collective, University of Ottawa, Canada

64. L’R des centres de femmes du Québec, Montréal, Canada

65. Luke’s Place, Support and Resource Centre for Women and Children in Durham Region, Ontario

66. National Association of Women and the Law (NAWL/ANFD), Ottawa, Ontario

67. Regroupement des maisons pour femmes victimes de violence conjugale, Montréal, Canada

68. Rise Women’s Legal Centre, Vancouver

69. West Coast LEAF, Vancouver, British Columbia.

70. Women’s Legal Education and Action Fund (LEAF FAEJ), Toronto, Canada

FRANCE

Experts:
71. Isabelle Beck, Family Law Lawyer, Lyon, France
72. Dr. Maurice Berger, Ph D, child psychiatrist, chief of child psychiatric ward in a university hospital, Professor of child psychopathology in Lyon 2, director of training at the National School of Judges in Paris
74. Dr Anne-Marie Clement, President of the Fédération des Comités Alexis Danan pour la Protection de l’Enfance, Paris, France
75. Dr Annie Dudin, Pediatrician, Tours, France
76. Dr. Andreea Ernst-Vintila, Associate professor of psychology, Université Paris-Nanterre, Paris Research Center for Social Psychology EA 4386, France
77. Marie Françoise Caminada, psychologist, Gourdon, France
78. Dr Marie-Paule Grossetete, doctor in evolutionary biology, member of the board of director of Osez le féminisme!, Paris, France.
79. Marie-Christine Gryson, clinical psychologist, ex judicial expert (26 years), Lille, France
80. Caroline Guesnier, President of CIVIFF (Collectif International Vaincre les Injustices Faites aux Femmes)
81. Mélanie Jauner, responsible for Antenne Ouest et Haut de France CIVIFF (Collectif International Vaincre les Injustices Faites aux Femmes)
82. Dr Eugénie Izard, child psychiatrist, President of the REPPEA (Réseau de Professionnels pour la Protection des Enfants et des Adolescents), Toulouse, France
83. Dr Catherine Le Magueresse, lawyer, expert on violence against women, Paris France
84. Pierre-Guillaume Prigent, PhD Student, University of Western Brittany, France
85. Meryl Puget, clinical psychologist and psychologue clinicienne, member of the board of directors of Osez le féminisme!, Paris, France.
86. Alexandra Rhodes, Clinical Psychologist, Child Psychotherapist, Expert at the Courts - Toulouse Court of Appeal, Toulouse, France
87. Dr Hélène Romano, Dr in psychopathology, HDR PhD CPP Lyon Est III, Lyon, France
88. Dr Brigitte Mélot Slama, member of the Board of Directors of the REPPEA (Réseau de Professionnels pour la Protection des Enfants et des Adolescents), Bagnolet France
89. Lucie Sabau, member of the board of director of Osez le féminisme!, Paris, France
90. Gwénola Sueur, Réseau International des Mères en Lutte, France
91. Stéphanie Vecchiato, responsable Antenne Sud Ouest CIVFF (Collectif International Vaincre les Injustices Faites aux Femmes)

92. Galia Yehezkieli, Child psychiatrist, Charenton-le-Pont, France

**Institution:**

93. Association REPPEA (Réseau de Professionnels pour la Protection des Enfants et des Adolescents, association of professionals network for child protection)

**ISRAEL**

**Experts:**

94. Gali Etzion, Attorney at Law, Director counselling & legislation department, Naamat Women’s Organization

95. Professor Daphna Hacker, Law Faculty and Head of Gender Studies Program, Tel Aviv University

96. Prof. Ruth Halperin-Kaddari, Professor at Bar-Ilan University Faculty of Law, Israel; Founding Head of the Rackman Center for the Advancement of Women at BIU; and former Vice-Chair of CEDAW

97. Dana Eisner-Lavi, Adv., Director of the Women’s Rights Clinic, College of Management School of Law

**Institution:**

98. The Ruth and Emanuel Rackmen Center for the Advancement of Women, Bar-Ilan University, Faculty of Law

**ITALY**

**Experts:**

99. Mariachiara Feresin, PhD Student, University of Trieste

100. Professor Patrizia Romito, PhD, Deputy Director for Equal Opportunities, Laboratory of Social and Community Psychology, University of Trieste, Italy

**NEW ZEALAND**

**Experts:**

101. Dr Peter Adams, Professor, Social & Community Health, University of Auckland

102. Dr Jackie Blue, former New Zealand Human Rights Commissioner (Women's Rights)
103. Jane Drumm, General Manager, Shine (Safer Homes in NZ Everyday) Auckland
104. Dr Vivienne Elizabeth, Associate Professor, Sociology, University of Auckland
105. Dr Nicola Gavey, Professor, Psychology, University of Auckland
106. Dr Deborah Hager, Lecturer, Health Promotion, School of Population Health, University of Auckland
107. Ruth Herbert, Co-Founder, The Backbone Collective
108. Dr Sue Jackson, Associate Professor, Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington
109. Dr Ang Jury, Chief Executive, National Collective of Women's Refuges, NZ
110. Dr Jade Le Grice, Lecturer, Psychology, University of Auckland
111. Deborah Mackenzie, Co-founder, The Backbone Collective, New Zealand
112. Dr Kathryn McPhillips, Clinical Psychologist, Executive Director, Auckland Sexual Abuse Help Foundation
113. Dr Mandy Morgan, Professor, Psychology, Massey University
114. Leonie Morris, Community Worker, Auckland Women's Centre, NZ
115. Nicola Paton, Family Violence Clearinghouse, University of Auckland, New Zealand
116. Dr Neville Robertson, Senior Lecturer, Psychology, Waikato University
117. Dr Michael Tarren-Sweeney, Professor of Child & Family Psychology, School of Health Sciences, University of Canterbury, New Zealand, editor of Developmental Child Welfare
118. Professor Julia Tolmie, Faculty of Law, The University of Auckland

**SPAIN**


**SWITZERLAND**

120. Glòria Casas Vila, Postdoctoral Fellow, Université de Lausanne, Switzerland

**UNITED KINGDOM**

Experts:

121. Dr Adrienne Barnett, Ph.D., Senior Lecturer – Law, Brunel University, London
122. Jenny Beck, Solicitor, Director of Beck Fitzgerald, LLP
123. Estelle de Boulay, Director, Rights of Women, London
124. Professor Shazia Choudhry, Department of Law, Queen Mary University, London
125. Olive Craig, Legal Officer, Rights of Women, London
126. Dr Julie Doughty, Ph.D., Lecturer in Law, Cardiff University School of Law and Politics
127. Professor Gillian Douglas, LL.D., FacSS, Executive Dean, The Dickson Poon School of Law, King’s College London
128. Jane Fortin, Emeritus Professor, University of Sussex
129. Sarbjit Ganger, Director, Asian Women’s Resource Centre, London
130. Mandip Ghai, Legal Officer, Rights of Women, London
131. Jonathan Herring, Professor of Law, Oxford University, England
132. Marianne Hester, Professor, Chair in Gender, Violence & International Policy, University of Bristol, UK
133. Melanie Johnson, Family Law Barrister, 1 Pump Court Chambers, London
134. Felicity Kaganas, Professor of Law, Brunel Law School
135. Mavis MacLean, Senior Research Fellow, University of Oxford
136. Professor Judith Masson, PhD, Professor of Socio-Legal Studies, University of Bristol Law School, University of Bristol
137. Dr Nina Maxwell, PhD, Senior Research Associate, Cardiff University School of Social Sciences
138. Dr Thomas Slater, PhD, Lecturer in Social Work, Cardiff University School of Social Sciences
139. Dr Leanne Smith, PhD, Senior Lecturer in Law, Cardiff University School of Law and Politics
140. Dr Liza Thompson, PhD, CEO of Sateda, UK
141. Professor Liz Trinder, University of Exeter
142. Suzanne Zaccour, Dphil student in law, Oxford University, Oxford, United Kingdom

UNITED STATES

Experts:
143. Caroline Bettinger-López, Professor of Clinical Legal Education, Director, Human Rights Clinic, University of Miami Law School
Dr Kelly J Champion, PhD, ABPP, Clinical and Forensic Psychologist, Cadeus Behavioral Health, Bethesda, Maryland

Cynthia Cummings, Attorney, Child Justice Inc. Silver Spring, MD

Margaret Drew, Associate Professor, University of Massachusetts Law School

Sasha Drobnick, Managing Attorney, Domestic Violence Legal Empowerment and Appeals Project (DV LEAP)

Dr Jeffrey L. Edleson, Ph.D., Dean, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley, California

Nancy Erickson, J.D., LL.M., M.A, Law Office of Nancy S. Erickson, member of the Practising Law Institute

Lisa Fischel-Wolovick, JD, MSW, Adj, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, City University of New York at John Jay College

Denise Gamache, MSW, Executive Director, Battered Women’s Justice Project, Minneapolis. The Project also manages the National Center on Protection Orders and Full Faith Credit

Dr Robert Geffner, Ph.D., ABN, ABP, Founding President, Institute on Violence, Abuse and Trauma, Distinguished Research Professor of Psychology, Alliant International University, San Diego

Paul Griffin, Legal Director, Child Justice Inc., Silver Spring, MD

Nathaniel Grube, Attorney, Child Justice Inc., Silver Spring, MD

Eileen King, E.D., Program Director, Child Justice Inc., Silver Spring MD

Dr Jean Mercer, PhD, Professor Emerita, Psychology, Stockton University, New Jersey and Founding Fellow, Institute for Science in Medicine

Joan Meier, Professor of Law, George Washington University Law School and Legal Director, Domestic Violence Legal Empowerment and Appeals Project (DV LEAP);

Sandi Capuano Morrison, Chief Executive Officer, Institute on Violence, Abuse and Trauma (IVAT); Board Member, National Partnership to End Interpersonal Violence Across the Lifespan (NPEIV) San Diego

Gimel Rogers, Psy.D, Training Director, IVAT

Kathleen Russell, Executive Director, Center for Judicial Excellence, California

Aileen Herlinda Sandoval, Psy.D., Forensic Associate, Institute on Violence, Abuse and Trauma (IVAT) and Family Violence and Sexual Assault Institute (FVSAI), San Diego

Alexandra Sandacz, Attorney, Child Justice Inc., Silver Spring, MD
163. Dr Daniel Saunders, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus, School of Social Work, University of Michigan
164. Lynn Hecht Schafran, Legal Director, National Judicial Education Program, The Women’s Legal Defense and Education Fund
165. Morgan Shaw, Psy.D, Clinical Director, Institute on Violence, Abuse & Trauma, San Diego
166. Sudha Shetty, Esq., Assistant Dean, International Alliances & Partnerships and Director, Hague Domestic Violence Project, Goldman School of Public Policy, University of CA, Berkeley
167. Dr Evan Stark, Ph.D, MSW, Professor Emeritus, Rutgers University
169. Dr Sarah Trane, PhD, Pediatric Psychologist, Mayo Clinic Health System, La Crosse, Wisconsin
170. Connie Valentine, California Protective Parents Association,
171. Merle Weiner, Philip H. Knight Professor of Law, University of Oregon
172. Jennifer White, Program Director, Futures Without Violence, San Francisco, Washington, Boston

**Institution:**
173. Legal Momentum, the Women’s Legal Defense and Education Fund, New York