

Re: Baby P article by Mary Wakefield – Spectator December 2007

Fortunately some people have more insight into this particular case matter than the author of the article, who evidently has done no research at all into the veracity of this ('Sarah', so called) woman's statements. Let's not mess about, 'Sarah' so called is actually Elizabeth, and her partner is [excluded] – they live in [excluded]. They are foster carers for a local authority albeit one is at a loss to understand that continued status as [excluded].

Elizabeth has a problem – it would take someone with a serious qualification in mental health to determine what Elizabeth ('Sarah') suffers with, but it might just be Munchausen's. Alternatively, Elizabeth is just evil – the latter interpretation of her has much merit and has my vote.

For those not familiar with this mental health condition, it is a seriously defective personality disorder needing a person to attract attention to others in order to detract attention from themselves, whilst also it allows them (in some distorted reality) to be seen as a protector or rescuer. In another form, Munchausen's by Proxy is the condition that parents and others use by applying abuse to a child in order to attract attention to themselves. The latter is now a little discredited after certain paediatricians were found wanting in their evidence against parents. Elizabeth falls into the former category, if either 'syndrome' were to apply in her case. In simple terms, she is rather largely obsessed and short on merit as far as facts are concerned, much in common with the author of the Spectator article.

What is quite evident to those in the know is what is missing from the Spectator article by this defective correspondent, for example that the CSCI review of the complaints against 'Happiness' (actually it is the former [excluded]) was in fact very thorough (completed by an independent consultant) and that in its history there was only ever one formal complaint against 'Happiness' and that was by this 'wonder woman' (Elizabeth) who is indeed resourceful – she must be resourceful to get article after article published near on 7 years after events in 2002. In fact, the independent review was highly critical of the former NCSC and its subsequent reborn CSCI. It was also very critical of 'wonder woman' and her rather odd MP – in fact they were so alarmed at its contents in draft form that they threatened Judicial Review. 'Wonder woman' and 'contrary Mary' overlooked mentioning this fact.

There are several illustrious editors of prestigious publications who have realised, too late before putting pen to paper (and in some cases to their cost), that 'wonder woman' is not quite what she appears to be. Indeed, they eventually find (on even basic research) 'Liz' to be rather lacking any credibility at all, let alone having a story to tell – and her partner does anything for an easy life. In fact, such credible and illustrious correspondents/editors have found themselves no less equal to the tabloid press such as the Sun or Express. Some editors and (so called) broadsheet journalists have needed to eat humble pie, and retract publications. Obviously Mary Wakefield has not been kept in the loop and journeyed down a road in fog with a blindfold, without a walking stick.

This previously anonymous 'wonder woman' (otherwise known as Elizabeth [excluded]) must be revealed – for the sake of man or womankind she must be thrust forward as the

saviour (Munchausen's) of the entire world or perhaps as a mother (Mmmm), a foster care worker (stop me laughing) or marker of professional judgement (pick me up off the floor) – she is, in fact, not capable of forming a reasoned judgement on anything and to boot is not qualified to do so on professional child care matters, much like her friend Mary Wakefield who in her appraisal of the issues demonstrates the ultimate capacity in performing a travesty resembling but far from professional journalism.

One would think, one would hope, that those who put pen to paper in a national publication would actually do some research rather than simply meet some stranger on a train platform with a 'big black folder'. It summons up the image: hello, Mrs Hilter (in Monty Python fashion) you have a black file tucked under your arm and you walk with confidence, so you must be correct in your assertion that you never had a hand in killing three million Jews as part of your 'final solution'. I will, says the journalist, publish your views and since you are so 'resourceful' I will add my credible signature to it.

If this is journalism, I fear for the world and this journalist's own grasp on reality, and her competence. In fact, she is obviously well versed in the art of writing, but less capable of undertaking basic fact finding to support her assertions.

Let us compare the journalist to the social workers she offers opinions upon.

Social Worker for Baby P – *'is he OK?'*

Mother of Baby P: *'Oh yes, he is fine – see all the chocolate smudges on his face'* [covering up numerous bruises]. Social worker: *'ah, great, no problems then, see you next week. I see you walk confidently and have a big black folder, so you must be a reliable person – no worry that many others have serious doubts about your competence and ability to safeguard your child.'*

Exactly who is this idiot of a journalist who meets a total stranger on a train platform and believes every word she is told – has she heard of 'evidencing' before publication, and what exactly are her qualifications other than journalistic prejudice. Perhaps she has a special reason for 'connecting' so easily with 'wonder woman' – perhaps she needs to talk through her problems. Perhaps she has an unhealthy passion for 'big black folders?' What exactly is her problem?

Also absent in the article is that 'wonder woman' left 'Happiness' at her own behest and squandered the opportunity to seek an informal resolution to her concerns, and the fact that Northamptonshire SSD gave a full apology for their error in not highlighting the background of the child they asked 'Happiness' to place on their behalf. 'Happiness' were not informed of the child's historical details either, despite what Elizabeth might say to promote her victimisation by others.

Nor has the journalist actually questioned anything. When 'Tom, Dick and Harriett' (so called in this fairy tale) were consulted by the NCSC, it was actually on the advice and agreement of Elizabeth and 'Happiness.' Not put forward by 'Happiness' alone, but with her

explicit agreement and understanding. Only after they could not find fault with ‘Happiness’ did Elizabeth then go on to harass them, in some cases several years after events.

Further absent is the fact that ‘wonder woman’ was taken to Court for defamation but this faltered when ‘wonder woman’ with her signature ‘big black folder’ claimed that she never retained any documentation which illustrates her deceit and contempt for the law, together with her defective argument of being treated dishonestly by others. The police would like to see her ‘big black folder’ to determine if she actually lied in her High Court statement.

Nor is it evident from this deficient article that ‘wonder woman’ has been formally warned by the police that her persistence with her complaints could cause her to be investigated for harassment, after in one case example she complained to the GSCC (who register social workers) twice and on the same issues then went on to make four complaints to three different police forces (after the GSCC dismissed the issues), and the police also dismissed the complaints after a full investigation. This activity is not resourcefulness or intelligence, it is pure and simple harassment of those who dare disagree with her distorted perception of events – and it would take no bear with a big brain to understand quickly that ‘wonder woman’ (or is she mother earth) is slightly lacking a sense of proportionality or indeed a grasp on reality. Indeed, it is quite evident that ‘wonder woman’ has such a distorted view of the world (call it ‘wonder woman’ centric) that probably only a lobotomy could correct her obsession. If the evidence does not fit, ‘wonder woman’ will exclude it not only from her thinking, but also from others who might question its relevance. This mother earth character is perhaps less ‘wonder woman’ and more magician, although in fact she is just simply dishonest, as is the article writer who has been lazy and fickle on an issue of child P whose honour is not served well by this falsehood and professional journalistic failings.

If readers believe ‘wonder woman’ is ‘resourceful’ or ‘intelligent’, think again and obtain the public document published by the CSCI on Elizabeth’s exploits – it makes for fascinating reading when one compares it with the rubbish written by Wakefield. Mary might just obtain a copy of the independent review to compare notes against that ‘big black file’ and fill in the gaps left out by [Excluded] and correct the untruths mouthed by Elizabeth – or is that like too much hard work? It’s called research – reference to it can be found in competent dictionaries.

Mary, Mary quite contrary – in fact Mary is a complete dork. I suggest you DO give up the day job, ASAP. Journalism is obviously not your forte, really. I hope however you and Elizabeth have a long and fruitful relationship as you deserve each other – you share a lack of credibility in the cool light of a winter day (or indeed any season). I will bet however, Mary will, as have hundreds of others, regret ever hearing of Elizabeth, Liz, Beth or as most consider her, ‘not that woman again.’ If, Mary, you doubt that prediction, try calling a few agencies (not least the police) and listen to the ‘groan’ after you mention Elizabeth [excluded]. It is really illuminating, unlike your journalism, so called.

[signature excluded]

Editors note: various parts of this article have been excluded from publication to protect the identity of various parties.

