

RESUMPTION OF ERRONEOUSLY SUSPENDED VISITS

It is in the child's best interests that contact and visits with the alienated parent be restored SWIFTLY and FULLY once the suspended contact was determined to be the result of unfounded CPS allegations and/or because the alienating parent had unilaterally prevented the contact.

One of the more pernicious and destructive alienating maneuvers is the leveling of false physical and/or sex abuse allegations against the targeted parent. This emotional form of child abuse is particularly detrimental in the case of sex abuse because, when a child believes that she/he had been sexually abused by a parent, then the traumatic results are equal to those of children who actually had been sexually abused. Exacerbating the damage, such allegations generally lead to the immediate suspension of all contact between the child and the targeted parent during the ensuing CPS investigation. Not only is contact missed, it allows for the poisoning to continue with no possibility for the antidote of the meaningful contact between the child and the targeted parent. Furthering the damage to the child of the suspended contact, the alienating parent invariably informs the child that she/he has been abandoned by the targeted parent!

Okay, so CPS has now unfounded all allegations, thereby paving the way for the resumption of visits and contact. Oh, really? Not so fast. This rarely happens because the alienating parent declares to the child's attorney and to the court that the child is too afraid to have contact resumed with the targeted parent; and naturally these sentiments are validated by the brainwashed puppet child. So the attorney for the child and the attorney for the alienating parent recommend the very slow resumption of contact----generally slower than watching grass grow. Some attorneys for the targeted parent have conveyed to me that this situation places them in a double-blind: if they ask for normal resumption of contact, the judge may deny everything. So frequently, the attorney for the targeted parent has little choice but to agree to the resumption of contact at a snail's pace and sometimes supervised.

THIS IS THE WORST POSSIBLE SOLUTION!

What follows are the reasons for my previous declaration as provided by some of the lawyers and forensic evaluators whom I interviewed for my book. I will then provide my own explanation why this is dumb, dumb, dumb.

Attorney Paul Levitt represented the alienated parent in New York's landmark case regarding parental alienation, *Young v. Young*, which developed the case law about alienation which states, "A custodial parent's interference with the relationship between child and the noncustodial parent has been said to be an act so inconsistent with the best interests of the child as to per se raise a strong probability that the offending party is unfit to act as a custodial parent." Mr. Levitt stated the following in his interview regarding the resumption of visits, "When allegations are unfounded, it should not be a question of slowly reintroducing the alienated parent to his child. It should be a question of removing the child from the from the parent who prompted the child to make these allegations. We

have been looking at it the wrong way. It shouldn't be how slowly the alienated parent should again develop the relationship with the child but rather how quickly we can remove the alienator from the relationship that she/he has with the child."

Lawyer for the Child, Susan Saltz, stated, "You can't give full rights immediately? I would say that's another way of depriving the children and the alienated parent of getting their relationship on the right track. You can't shoot your parents dead and then throw yourself on the mercy of the court because you are an orphan. The alienator is the one who caused the separation, and then they have the audacity to demand that things proceed at a snail space?"

Lawyer Robert Hiltzik stated in regards to the slow reinstatement of visits, "I know when this is done, it validates that something is wrong with the alienated parent by going slowly."

Forensic evaluator, Ray Havlicek, Ph.D., took issue with the suspension of visits to begin with. Particularly because his experience has been that, in the vast number of PAS cases, the sex abuse allegation is frivolous. His belief regarding this was stated as follows, "You don't suddenly stop visitation. If you stop the visitation, nine times out of 10 it is the wrong reason. The damage that this causes to the child's belief is immense. The child then thinks, 'Oh, now the judge is saying it about my father (mother.) My mother (father) must be right about him (her).' There is really a problem with this approach. The system must be changed."

Lawyer for the child, Evie Zarkadas, stated, "The residential parent has to lead the way. Children will take their cue from the residential parent. If the residential parent shows interest and is an instrumental force encouraging the relationship with the other parent, the visitation happens; it is never a problem!"

Attorney, Joshua Hecht, stated the following regarding the visit, "More is better because when the child is not with the alienated parent they are under the influence of the alienating parent so that has to be counteracted as much as possible."

Again referencing attorney, Robert Hiltzik, he stated "If you can't get your child to go on the visits, then you can't be the residential parent. Part of being a parent is that you tell the kids what to do. What happens when the child doesn't go to school? To medical appointments? So, if the child doesn't want to do something, they don't have to do it? We are making decisions for children all the time. Why are they allowed to decide whether or not to see the other parent?"

I could not agree more with the wisdom of all my esteemed colleagues. There is NO scientific or credible research that supports the idea that going slowly with reinstating visits between the child and a loving parent needs to proceed at a snail's space. In fact, just the opposite is true. The professionals who intervene in child custody and visitation must cease and desist from enabling the alienator thereby perpetuating the alienation when they sanction the separation of children from their alienated parent.

