

As recently as 1994 I attended an adoption conference in Sydney and on the table of the DOC's was an adoption package that was given to social workers to assist them in communicating the adoption option to young women in this country. Here are a list of coercive statements used to shift the identity of the unsuspecting young pregnant mother, another example of the subtle techniques that are used to brainwash a mother out of her baby!

SPECIFIC READINESS SIGNS FOR BIRTH PARENTS YOU MAY BE READY IF

- a Your lifestyle is not accommodating to children and you are unable/unwilling to change it at this time
- b You do not possess parenting tools and are unable/unwilling to learn them at this time.
- c You do not have quality time to spend with your child.
- d You are making this decision yourself, not to please others. You are not trying to get back at or get even with anyone.
- e You are not depending on being able to have subsequent children (According to a Concerned United Birth Parents Study 38% of birth parents who surrender do not have other children)*.
- f You feel responsible and are not trying to avoid dealing with the fact that you are a parent even though that may soon mean you are a non-custodial parent.
- g You acknowledge your child's progressive right to make decisions about his/her relationships as (s)he matures.
- h You like yourself! You have a sense of humour.

* Dr Geoff Rickarby, psychiatrist and adoption expert is quoted in the Newcastle Times as putting the figure as high as 50%. This statement though, is the only one I believe that is factual and non-coercive in this list.

Can you imagine a 14 or 15-year old getting their head around this load of gobbledey gook? (h) You will certainly need a sense of humour to deal with the years of pathological grief you have ahead of you.

Another piece of information that I came across that begs to be answered is what connection is there between social engineering policies formulated in Tavistock and the adoption practices that were employed in the late fifties, sixties and early seventies. Dr Geoff Rickarby has stated, in part of his testimony in a recent case on behalf of a birth mother who had her child illegally taken, that all information pertaining to adoption was sent to the Tavistock Centre in England.

Dr John Bowlby, whose theories underpinned modern adoption was also working from this same centre. It is my understanding that Tavistock was a think tank that was very interested in formulating policies to be used to control and manipulate society for what was considered by an academic minority to be in society's best interests.

Is this what happened to us? Were we part of this experiment that went horribly wrong? I wonder!