

BURNT & BRANDED BY SECRET SYSTEMS OPERATIONS
CEL III July 1, 2016

Imagine that you had a fire in your kitchen in 1992, called your local fire department for help, the minor fire was extinguished with one or two squirts from a single fireman's canister, the fire department went away and wrote a report, and then issued you a written warning on kitchen safety because you had been burning too much corn-oil or fat of some kind and this caused your fire. You wouldn't imagine that this was a major crisis, would you? If it happened in May, you'd probably have forgotten it by Christmas.

But now imagine that in 2013 you applied for fire insurance on your new home, or applied to join your local volunteer fire department, and were told, "Well, uh, we can't help you: you have a conviction for ARSON in 1992." You would be shocked, you would be horrified. You would claim that your rights had been violated. And you would be right.

We like to imagine that we are free in this country and that the government works for us, and only restricts our freedom to live and engage in the pursuit of happiness according to certain very clear rules about "crime" and "punishment." All parents, or almost all parents, to be realistic, believe that they do everything they can to provide the best for their children, to the best of their abilities. And because it is so natural for us to care for our offspring, and so obvious that children depend on their parents for all aspects of their existence, we regard crimes against children as the worst and most loathsome offenses.

What very few of us imagine in the USA is that the government has set up in each state an apparatus of "child protection and family services" (largely mandated through Title 42 of the United States Code nationalizing all aspects of "Public Health & Welfare) which has only the murkiest, vaguest, and most imprecisely defined standards as to what constitutes "child abuse" or an injury to children. And if the basic definitions of these crimes are "obscure" (to put it mildly), the administrative and bureaucratic "social service agents" who enforce these rules are among the most poorly trained, most disorganized and uncoordinated branches of law enforcement in the United States or, indeed, in the world.

In fact, for parents of all socio-economic classes throughout the United States, the initials “CPS” (“Child Protective Services”) or in New Jersey the “Department of Children & Families” (DCF), especially the Division of Child Permanency & Placement (“DCPP”) have become almost as terrifying as the words NKVD, KGB, or GeStaPo (“Geheimstaatspolizei”) were to generations of Russians and Germans were in the early and middle parts of the 20th Century.

So in 1992 a woman took her small son to the hospital for some minor injuries. Kids get hurt around the house, we all know it happens. Because the child described being disciplined by his mother, and because a minor was involved, the hospital called the New Jersey DCF, who came out and made a routine report. They effectively issued a warning to the woman that what had happened sounded a little bit like “child abuse” and so they were writing it down that way. They called it “an instance of child abuse substantiated.”

No consequences were attached and no follow-up was required. It was EXACTLY like the hypothetical warning on Kitchen safety described above. “Please be more careful in the future; Have a Nice Day!”

Now those words “child abuse substantiated” meant nearly nothing in 1992: Mom might or might not have gotten a little too rough with junior in disciplining him or enforcing a time out.... But “just be careful in the future.”

But during the legislative years 1994-1995, New Jersey apparently reframed the definition of a “child abuse substantiation” quite a bit: all of a sudden, from 1995 on, to be listed with “child abuse substantiated” was almost as bad as being on the “Sex Offender” list: a “substantiated child abuser” was thenceforth to be labeled a bad apple, a dangerous person.

As Lisa von Pier put it, on pages 8-9 of her August 5, 2014 Opinion Substantiating “Child Abuse” allegations against the woman, while von Pier was acting in her Administrative-Judicial Capacity for the DCPP:

"Prior to June 29, 1995, the impact of a substantiation was much different than it is today. Substantiations of abuse and neglect were then maintained for internal investigatory purposes and were not then released to child care providers and

in the other limited circumstances currently mandated by N.J.S.A., 9:6-8.10(a). Because the records were maintained for investigative purposes, persons substantiated prior to that were not necessarily notified of the substantiation of abuse or neglect, ***and were not guaranteed a hearing by regulation.*** The DCF has accommodated persons who were substantiated prior to June 29, 1995, by allowing an opportunity to appeal a substantiation of abuse or neglect beyond the 20-day time frame allotted in N.J.A.C. 10:120A-2.5(a)."

What Lisa von Pier had not realized was that BY THESE VERY WORDS, issued by her in her official capacity as a "Judge of Final Recourse" in regard to "Substantiations" of Child abuse. she was convicting herself, the DCF, and the DCPP of violating upon and infringing the woman Civil Rights by Enforcement of an Ex-Post Facto law, namely a serious enhancement in the severity of the "substantiation" issued by DCF in 1992.

This enhancement in the penalty attached to the "conviction" was so radical as to potentially change and alter the woman's life, and that of her children, forever.

Since 2013 the FCVFC ("Foundation for the Child Victims of Family Courts") has assisted the woman in defending her rights. Nor ordinarily licensed attorney could be bothered to help her at all. But FCVFC assisted the woman with the research she needed, as a pro se litigant, to identify and challenge Lisa von Pier's actions...and the woman eventually obtained a nullification of the pejorative label, penal category or designation "child abuse".

FCVFC has now taken steps towards preparing the woman to sue for a violation of her civil rights. The woman's life could have been ruined by actions from the DCF and the DCPP which were completely and totally illegal as applied to her.

The files that these bureaucracies maintain on the American people is vast, and computer tracking permits "updating and upgrading" reports and evaluations from decade-to-decade, even from generation-to-generation. the woman had NO way of knowing about the reclassification of HER 1992

incident from a non-event into the functional equivalent of a felony for which she simply was never convicted, nor informed of her indictment.

“Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty”, and that is FCVFC’s function and purpose---to find and help those who would otherwise be helpless against such transgressions over time.