

Universal Periodic Review on 2021

Violation of families in the Kingdom of Denmark

By the none-profit organisations

Association of Stop Violence against Children

Stop Vold mod Børn

Moltkesvej 2, 4291 Ruds Vedby, Denmark, tel: +45 6022 8366

VAT: 369 36 441

&

Association of Parents to Children in Foster Care

Klip

Gl. Jennumvej 12, 2. t.h. 8930 Randers NØ, Denmark, tel: +45 6067 7647

VAT: 405 84 951



Content

COMPULSORY PLACEMENT

Preamble	3
The Kingdom of Denmark - Universal Periodic Review on 2021	4
Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment	7
The economy	8
Doctor visits	9
The Criminal Code Article 119a	9

CUSTODY AND FAMILY COURT

Preamble	10
Background of the Parental Responsibility Act of 2007	11
International criticism of the Parental Responsibility Act of 2007	13
Revised Parental Responsibility Act, April 2019	15
The children	17
Recommendations	18



Preamble for compulsory placement

The United Nations Children's Committee "(COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD)" expressed concern in "Concluding observations – Denmark, Thirty-ninth session" of November 23, 2005 about the increasing number of placement of children outside the home in Denmark.

Paragraph 33 states, among other things, that "a thorough assessment of the need for" placement of children outside the home does not always take place in Denmark, and that contact between the placed child and the parents is "very limited".

Paragraph 34 recommends, among other things, that the Danish authorities increase their efforts to provide support to the children and their parents in order to limit the number of out-of-home placement.

The United Nations Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children of February 24, 2010, paragraph 11 (a) (3) lays down the principle that placement of children outside their families should be organized in order to maximize the possibility of, that the child can return to his or her family. The following sections describe the efforts that authorities must make to support families in caring for their own children.

In point (a) of the section on "Children deprived of a family environment" in "Concluding Observations" of the Committee on the Rights of the Child concerning Denmark of 4 February 2011, the Committee recommends that the Danish authorities to a greater extent "offer sufficient support" ("provide appropriate support") to families to limit the extent of placement of children outside the home.

The United Nations Children's Committee "(COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD)" expressed again concern in "Concluding observations - Denmark" of September 29, 2017 about the increasing number of out-of-home placement of children in Denmark.

Although the Danish society has become considerably richer and with a better health in the last 100 years, the number of children placed outside their homes is consistently 1 % - 1,2 %. The only period that there has been a difference was during the second world war from 1939 – 1945.



The Kingdom of Denmark - Universal Periodic Review on 2021.

The Danish prime minister Mette Frederiksen stated in the New Year speech on January 1, 2020 that there will be an increasing number of compulsive placements of children in Denmark. Further, the prime minister proclaimed to have more forced adoptions of children.

A bill has been passed that deprives parents and children their rights under the Convention with a view of being able to place more children outside their homes and reducing the possibility of the children being able to return home before the age of 18 year-old.

The bill: Lov om ændring af lov om social service (Ro og stabilitet for udsatte børn og unge og styrkelse af forældres retssikkerhed i anbringelsessager) jf. lovbekendtgørelse nr. 798 af 7. august 2019.

In year 2019 the Ministry of Social Affairs and the Interior made an “inspiration guide” for social workers in order to forcedly adopt more children.

It is only a requirement of law to render probable that the parents are unable to care for the child. By that the case law reveals that social workers are not required to prove the allegations brought against the parents.

The forced adoptions are based on the same proceedings as compulsive placement cases with the total lack of rule of law and legal certainty in the case proceedings. Parents have their children forcedly placed or adopted on basis of assumptions and incorrect information. These cases often bare forged documents and ordered results at private practises psychologist or psychiatrist as seen in the below mentioned case material. We refer to the Spanish history of Francisco Franco, who established forced adoptions based on, who he would allow to be good parents and not on, who were good parents. It is the same matter in the Kingdom of Denmark. At the hearing of the adoption law was The National Association for infertile (Landsforeningen for Ufrilligt Barnløse LFUB), The Association for Adoption and Society (Adoption og Samfund) among others, which members are of the higher middle class and the upper class in the Kingdom of Denmark. After the law was implied, the state closed the international adoption proceedings.



The European Court of Human Rights recently handed down a judgment in the key case:

CASE OF STRAND LOBBEN AND OTHERS v. NORWAY, no. 37283/13, September 10, 2018, which prevent the states to initiate coercive measures on an uncertain basis and which states that a placement outside the home has to be a temporary measure with the ultimate aim of reuniting child and parents.

Further the judgement stated that the *decision-making process* must be in accordance with a high degree of rule of law. The case law of the European Court of Human Rights clearly states that any placement outside the home must be:

"Temporary measure" and that any step in a compulsory removal must be compatible with the ultimate goal of reuniting the family ("ultimate aim of reuniting the natural parents and the child").

Only in cases where the authorities have tried to reuniting families and it cannot happen, a forced adoption can take place.

What is behind the scenes of this scenario is that the authorities order false reports on the parents and children in order to prove that a reuniting has been tried but could not happen.

Many parents have recorded meetings with their children in secret to prove the falseness of these reports. Further, many parents have recorded meetings with social workers to prove the threats held against them as "I will make sure you will never get your child back". The humiliation they are exposed to and the miscarriage of justice in compulsive placement cases due to the regime on this particular area, many people choose not to have children in Denmark.

The Danish minister of the Ministry of Social- and Interior Astrid Krag has stated in the press that case-law from the European Court of Human Rights does not apply on Denmark if the case does not concern Denmark. Further, the minister stated that Denmark had supported Norway in the case of Strand-Lobben to which the Danish state continues to do so.



“Mette Frederiksen's ambition for more children to be adopted through coercion is on a collision course with the European Court of Human Rights. In any case, a judgment against Norway from September immediately stands in the way of the prime minister's plans.”

“You do not think that a judgment of the European Court of Human Rights will affect adoption without consent in Denmark?”

“I think you have to be very careful to conclude too much from a single judgment in a very special case, where countries like Denmark and the UK did support Norway, and where part of the argument - as I understand it - for that way, on which the verdict was based, was that the information base for the Norwegian case was out of date. So, there was some old information in the case.”

The Council of Europe’s Committee of Ministers is holding quarterly meetings to oversee the execution of judgments and decisions from the European Court of Human Rights. The focus is that judgments from the European Court of Human Rights must be respected by all member states.

We further draw attention to the Danish state’s obligations according to the Council of Europe’s binding report submitted on June 6, 2018: *“Striking a balance between the best interest of the child and the need to keep families together”* that specify the obligation of the European states to ensure that children are protected and remain with their parents. In this obligation, states in particular are required to ensure legal certainty in cases involving families.

The Kingdom of Denmark lack respect of judgments from the European Court of Human Rights and the requirements and recommendations from the United Nation. The forced removals of children are based on a high degree of no legal basis and on allegations with no legal ground, which become systematically torture towards families on Danish ground.

In accordance with Article 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights a compulsive placement must be a temporary measure. In the Kingdom of Denmark, it is the opposite point of view. A compulsive placement lasts the entire childhood and when the child is grown the child can then reunite with its parents and biological family.



Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

The organisation Physicians for Human Rights (PHR) has recently committed the report “You Will Never See Your Child Again”, The Persistent Psychological Effects of Family Separation, February 2020 in which the comparison to the Danish states behaviour towards families are similar.

The procedure in compulsive placement cases, which are not needed, and the damages done towards the children and parents are considered as violations of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

Please take notice of the legal procedure in a forced removal case in the report of September 7, 2018 committed by the independent legal organisation Justitia describing how the Danish state's international obligations are systematically violated.

In relation to the errors in the proceedings identified by Justitia in their report, it should be mentioned that the entire process in the appeal system reflects a system that covers each other and fails to ensure legal certainty for families. This notwithstanding that there is an administrative appeal body and a court hearing. The whole system depends on allegations brought by a social worker, where it is not a requirement that the allegations to be proved.

Further, it is common that social workers order false reports on parents from private parties to make and/or remain a compulsive placement of a child. Private parties as psychologist, psychiatrist, consultants etc. are earning great money on these violations.

Parents are very often declared mentally ill by a social worker without the need for an independent psychiatrist to determine if there are any illnesses in this regard that can prevent parents from taking care of their children's best interests. Please see the attached cases regarding normal and good parents, who are met with these allegations.



The Social workers draw up an Action Plan in the case, where it is often a criterion for parents to *cooperate and gain confidence in the system*. If a parent complains about a decision or incorrect information in the case, that parent will be deemed *uncooperative and unable to gain confidence in the system* and cannot therefore have the child brought back.

The system reflects the mindset of a communistic system where parents are forced to accept to be subject to Cruel, Inhumane and Humiliating treatment. Rarely the child is brought back to the parents after a compulsive placement has taken place. The statistic shows that only 2 % are winning their case. These cases mainly regard parents, who have accepted to be subject to the torture that is practiced, and which does not openly tell what has been done to them. Further, these cases are often teenage children, who will soon turn 18 and therefore not a subject for economical profit.

The economy

The United Nation has adopted the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, which the Kingdom of Denmark signed in 1951, but has not yet ratified. Though the compulsive placement area does not comply with the criteria of trafficking children for slavery or sexual abuse, the municipalities and private companies speculate in placement of children to make money. Children in compulsive placement cases in Denmark are exposed to another kind of trafficking for economical profit.

In 2007, the Kingdom of Denmark got a municipal reform, which meant that the country's 98 municipalities gained further autonomy. As a result of this autonomy, the 98 municipalities are largely managed as 98 companies where there must be a profit.

Compulsive placements are an expensive measure for the municipalities, which led to refund on 80 % from the state and further refund from the state in the yearly delegating block grants to the municipalities. The compulsive placements of children became an economical profit for the municipalities as the state gives more money than what a municipality must spend on a placement.



Each year the municipalities contract with private companies that offer parental competence surveys, foster families, child studies, observation of contact between parent and child etc. in the same package. The municipalities purchased in a framework agreement with the company in question. A framework agreement is based on the more quantity, the cheaper.

As these companies' products are based on implementing a compulsory placement that can be served at the various stages of the process, these companies used by the municipalities are not objective and habile in their work with the families. They are companies with profit as the municipalities profits on the refund system from the state. If the parents are paying for an examination at a psychologist or a psychiatrist outside this system for them to prove they are not mentally ill, the examination will be refused in the case. All families are bound to lose in a compulsive placement case.

Doctor visits:

Another side effect on the violations on families are that parents are afraid to seek medical help at the doctor as they are afraid that the medical file can be misused against them in a children case.

The Criminal Code Article 119a:

In year 2018 the Criminal Code was added a new Article 119a which states:

§ 119 a. Anyone who violates the peace of any of the persons mentioned in section 119 by contacting, prosecuting or otherwise harassing the person during the performance of the service or profession or for the same shall be punished by a fine or imprisonment for up to 2 years.

para 2. In determining the punishment, emphasis should be placed on the significance that the offense may have for the performance of the service or the job of the person concerned.

This Article is used to punish people when they tell about the violations of Human Rights and the torture they are exposed to by personnel of the municipalities and the state. The Article is forcing people to remain silent about what they are exposed to by the authorities and the courts. Lawyers are being harassed by the police too according to Article 119a when they speak up about the crimes against humanity done by the Danish state.



Preamble for custody and family court

In custody and visitation cases in Denmark gender equality politics and generating statistical values showing that fathers are equally attaining full custody of children seems to be the underlying cause of the degrading and inhumane treatment domestic violence survivors meet in the family court system. The rising number of admissions of mothers and children into protective facilities and shelters are not reflected in custody cases where one parent obtain full custody.

In February 2020, Physicians for Human Rights (PHR) published the report *You Will Never See Your Child Again, The Persistent Psychological effects of Family Separation*¹ which accentuates how children and protective parents display a variety of grave symptoms pertaining to Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome due to severe traumatisation during and after forced separation.

Danish children and mothers develop critical symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Syndrome, depression and anxiety due to the case handling and direct threats of separation unless they collaborate with their abuser as well as the separation itself. Mothers of foreign nationality may be forced to reside outside Denmark when they lose part of the custody and mothers and children are separated indefinitely.

The Prime Minister of Denmark Mette Frederiksen recently dismissed implementing the Convention of the Rights of the Child into Danish law. In recent years the Parliament several times voted against the implementation. We refer to Bill 45 '*Proposal for a parliamentary resolution on the incorporation of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child into Danish law*'.²

¹ Physicians for Human Rights (2020) *You Will Never See Your Child Again; The persistent psychological effects of family separations*, URL: <https://phr.org/our-work/resources/you-will-never-see-your-child-again-the-persistent-psychological-effects-of-family-separation/>

² B 45 Proposal to incorporate the child convention into Danish law: <https://www.ft.dk/samling/20181/beslutningsforslag/B45/BEH1-49/forhandling.htm>



The primary argument for the rejection of the implementation of the Convention of the Rights of the Child is the transference of competence from the Danish Parliament to the courts. The argument is contrary to the rule of law³.

Background of the Parental Responsibility Act of 2007

It follows from the nature of Article 9 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child that the child must not be separated from her/his parents. It follows from the same Article that the child must be protected from abuse and violence. The latter requirement has not been observed by Danish authorities due to the introduction of the Parental Responsibility Act in 2007.

‘Equal right to both biological parents’ became the principal focus in the Parental Responsibility Act of 2007 as it was considered to be in the foremost best interest of the child. Protection, safety, and attachment was downgraded as important factors in evaluating the child’s best interest.

To mainstream this practice psychologists and caseworkers developed a method and practice validating the child’s right to both parents as being in its best interest. The practice involves the consensus that the worst a child can experience is to be put in a ‘loyalty conflict’ between its biological parents. Consequently, the definition of good parenting became skills of collaboration and not skills of caring and protecting. Domestic violence survivors and mothers of abused children are to a very high degree accused of alienating fathers despite solid documentation of violence and/or abuse. Allegations of postpartum depression and mental illness are habitually utilised to discredit mothers although these allegations are not substantiated in medical records.

We refer to the Ministry of Social Affairs’ legislative guide to the Parental Responsibility Act no. 9279 of 20/3 2019 where it is stated:

“If the other parent is the best suited to accommodate the collaboration regarding the child and ensure contact to the other parent it must be included as a strong element for transferring custody to the other parent”.

³ BT (2019) Mette Frederiksen wants to be the children’s prime minister but refuse to incorporate the child convention: <https://www.bt.dk/politik/mette-frederiksen-vil-vaere-boernenes-statsminister-men-hun-vil-ikke-inkorporere>

The notion that collaboration is the foremost important skill as a parent and the persistent dismissal of including evidence of domestic violence and abuse of children into the evaluation of custody and visitation cases has resulted in a significant increase in mothers who lose custody of their children. During the past six years, *single* fathers in Denmark with sole custody has increased by 9 % nationally and in the municipality of Copenhagen by 16.1 %. In one municipality, the increase is as much as 46 %. When adding fathers who are *in relationships* who have been granted residence status and full custody the increase is much higher. The main reason for granting a father full custody is that *he will be the best parent to ensure that the child has equal rights to both parents*. This despite hospital reports, statements from protective facilities and specialized psychologists or psychiatrists confirming domestic violence and/or child abuse. Most psychologists employed by the family court system wrongly attribute a child's statements on abuse to the mother who is then accused of trying to affect the child in an attempt to alienate the father.

In 2011, Socialstyrelsen⁴ published a four-year study on 'Children and women in families with violence'. The study demonstrated that the Agency of Family Law (previously Statsforvaltningen) disregarded evidence of violence and sexual abuse of children and mothers and forced children to live with violent and abusive parents. Moreover, the study found that many parents did not inform the authorities about their concerns of sexual abuse because those concerns would not be believed and perhaps result in loss of custody.

In 2013, an empiric study by the department of trauma psychology at the University of Southern Denmark confirmed that mothers who are victims of stalking from the father of their child develop Post-Traumatic Stress Syndrome due to the case handling by Danish authorities. The study revealed that mothers and their children are disbelieved and humiliated with little or no support to cease the stalking. 13,3% of the mothers reported that they withheld information about stalking to the Agency of Family Law as they feared to appear *crazy* to those evaluating the wellbeing of the children or because they are too afraid of their stalker⁵.

⁴ Socialstyrelsen.dk is part of the Ministry of Social and Domestic Affairs and act as a counselling body on social matters concerning children, disabilities and vulnerable groups.

⁵ Schandorph, S. & Elklit, A. (2013) *Med Barnet som Gidsel – Stalking af Mødre*. Videnscenter for Traumatologi: Syddansk Universitet (SDU)



Despite children's firm protest and detailed descriptions of violence and abuse psychologists, custody evaluators and social workers routinely attribute the child's opposition to a violent father as being caused by the mother. The absence of knowledge of domestic violence and child abuse may contribute to this bias⁶, however gender equality politics appear to contribute considerably to this practice.

Between 2016 to 2018 twenty-two (22) children were killed by their parents of which the majority were killed by a vindictive father⁷. Although the number of children killed by their father is nearly equivalent to the number of women killed by their partner each year the issue is barely mentioned by the press or the politicians.

International criticism of the Parental Responsibility Act of 2007

In 2016, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) in case communication no. 46/2012 of March 14, 2016, para 5.5⁸. found that the Parental Responsibility Act was violating international law. CEDAW decided, by an overwhelming majority, to demand that Denmark change its family law within six months. The Committee's decision was made by 18 votes in favour and one against.

The government disregarded the report from CEDAW and the mother in the case has not seen her son since he was abducted by S. in the street in Austria. The practice towards mothers remain the same today indicating a gender biased viewpoint resulting in fathers abducting children who legally reside abroad without consequences.

⁶ Perrin, R.L. (2017) *Overcoming biased views of gender and victimhood in custody evaluations when domestic violence is alleged*. American University Journal of Gender, Social Policy & the Law, Vol.25 (2), pp. 154-177.

⁷ Nielsen S. (2019) Expert: A pattern is repeated when parents kill their children. URL: <https://nyheder.tv2.dk/2019-06-12-ekspert-et-moenster-gaar-igen-naar-foraeldre-slaar-deres-boern-ihjel>

⁸ The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), (2016). Communication No. 46/2012 M.W. v. Denmark. *Follow-up observations of the Government of Denmark*, Copenhagen.



In May 2019, a Danish father violently abducted his 2-year-old son in a playground in Ukraine. Hereafter the Danish Embassy in Kiev hid him and the child for more than a week⁹ notwithstanding that the child legally resided with his mother in Ukraine. The child was only recovered and handed back to his mother because the Ukrainian foreign minister adamantly demanded that the Danish state returned the child. As part of the agreement to have the child returned to his mother the Danish minister of foreign affairs insisted that the grandmother remained from filing charges of violence towards the father who had violently punched her in the face when he abducted the child.

In 2013, a commission from the European Parliament submitted a critical report concerning the Danish child and custody abuse. An investigative delegation travelled to Denmark with the purpose of evaluating the practice in custody cases based on initial reports suggesting that children and protective parents were being mistreated by the Danish authorities¹⁰. Based on interviews with protective parents and evaluation of custody cases the delegation found that Denmark failed to protect children from violent and abusive parents.

Some of the mothers who told the delegation about the situation in Denmark was hereafter charged and found guilty of defamation by Danish courts although their statements to the delegation was supported by substantial evidenced.

November 2017, GREVIO published a baseline report¹¹ including an assessment of the custody and visitation practice executed by Danish authorities and especially the Agency of Family Law was criticised. GREVIO established that Denmark fails to protect women and children who are victims of domestic violence and abuse.

⁹ Thieden, A. (2019) *Danish father accused of abduction in a political drama. Lives with 2-year old son in the Danish Embassy for the seventh day*. URL: <https://www.berlingske.dk/internationalt/dansk-far-anklaget-for-bortfoerelse-i-storpolitisk-drama-bor-med>

¹⁰ Werthmann, A. Jahr, P. & Angulo, Cl., European Parliament (2013) *The European Parliament Committee: Fact finding report*.

¹¹ GREVIO (2017) *Baseline report: Violence against women and domestic violence, Denmark*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. URL: <https://rm.coe.int/grevio-first-baseline-report-on-denmark/16807688ae>



The demand from the UN in 2016 should have initiated that Danish authorities reopened and re-evaluated approximately 100,000 custody and visitation cases in order to make decisions complying with the UN recommendations and international law.

Revised Parental Responsibility Act, April 2019

April 2019 a revised Parental Responsibility Act was introduced and the right of the child to be protected from violence and abuse was prioritised. However, the practice continues resulting in victims of domestic violence, mainly mothers, voicing concern about violence and sexual abuse of their children lose custody and residence status of their children. Collaboration skills are still valued as the foremost important parental skill although VIVE (The Danish Center for Social Science Research) in 2017 concluded that collaboration between parents where domestic violence is an issue is unrealistic and unhealthy.¹² Thus the practice is contrary to empiric information.

Although the revised Parental Responsibility Act from 2019 states that the safety of the child is priority evidence of domestic violence and abuse of children is still dismissed by the Agency of Family Law and the Family courts. Instead, unsubstantiated allegations of postpartum depression and mental illness contribute to decisions in the Agency of Family Law and the Family courts.

The revised Parental Responsibility Act consistently defines domestic violence as violence *between* the parents although in the majority of cases domestic violence is violence from one parent towards the other parent with the majority of victims being the mother.

Feedback from mothers and lawyers suggest that the practice of ignoring evidence of domestic violence and abuse of children is worsening. Many mothers also report that the Family Courts pressure them to disclose their protected address to the perpetrator increasing the risk of the children witnessing their mother being attacked.

A widespread bias against women among psychologist performing child evaluations appears persistently to be the foundation for decisions in custody cases.

¹² VIVE (2017) *Forældrekonflikter efter samlivsbruddet*. URL: <https://www.vive.dk/da/udgivelser/foraeldrekonflikter-efter-samlivsbruddet-6821/>



The director of Dansk Psykolog Forenings Selskab for Børnesagkyndige, an association of psychologists performing child evaluations in custody cases, officially announced back in 2016 that his mission was to create equality among mothers and fathers in custody cases¹³.

Psychologists and child evaluators are not bound by specific methods and the randomness within this field based on the psychologist's personal bias can cause severe harm to the child.

On September 8, 2020, the Supreme Court emphasised that the practice could continue undisturbed by deciding to award a father full custody of a 3-year-old child although there was a long history of domestic abuse and stalking.¹⁴ The domestic violence was never assessed and the mother's reactions to the abuse was contributed to her personality and not evaluated as a consequence of the violence and stalking she had experienced. The child was taken away from his mother and was not allowed to see her for 5 months despite the father was given full custody because he was believed to be best suited to guarantee the child *equal rights* to his parents.

When abusive fathers get full custody they often disallow the child to see its mother and sometimes the child will be placed in foster care by the father. This suggest that getting full custody is part of a control and power scheme and not because the father has any interest in the child. In these cases, we observe a pattern where the father has not had any interest in the child, or even rejected his paternity until the mother leaves him.

There are numerous examples of protective mothers who lose contact to their children as the authorities in order to bond the child to the father decide that the child must be protected against the mother's "negative view" on the father suggesting a structural pattern of victim blaming within the custody and visitation system.

¹³ Kaster, M. (2016) New law must equalize parents. Politiken 7th September 2016. URL: <https://politiken.dk/debat/kroniken/art5634952/Ny-lov-skal-ligestille-skilsmisseforældre>

¹⁴ The Supreme Court decision, September 2020, URL: <https://www.domstol.dk/hoejesteret/aktuelt/2020/9/om-foraeldremyndighed/>



Though the politicians in 2018 admitted that the Parental Responsibility Act from 2007 and its consequential practice was not in the *best interests of the child* the government has not ordered a re-evaluation of the cases based on other principles than the best interest of the child.

Nor has the government proposed legislation on compulsory training in understanding abuse and battering dynamics for those persons making decisions in custody cases including psychologists and judges.

The children

As of yet studies on the extent of trauma in children separated from their protective parents has not been conducted in Denmark. However, we have noticed an increase in forced placement into foster care of the children where an abusive and violent father has attained full custody.

Further serious failure to thrive and diagnosis of mental and physical disorders are common among children who are forced to live with a father who has committed domestic violence or abuse the child. Although, the child's wellbeing was optimal in the care of the mother Danish authorities equally blame the mother for the child's lack to thrive in the father's custody or even fully contribute the child's state to the mother's efforts of protecting the child. The latter accusation frequently results in full discontinuation of contact between the mother and child.

Since 2016 experts has identified an escalation of children and young people who fail to thrive. There has during the past eleven years been a 90 % increase in children and young people in psychiatric treatment. There is a 200 % increase in children and young people with anxiety and depression in the same period. According to the national Agency of Health 19 % of all young people struggle with mental health issues¹⁵.

The increase in failure to thrive among Danish children has progressed correspondingly to the harmful practice of the Parental Responsibility Act from 2007.

¹⁵ Børns Vilkår (Children's Welfare) (2019) Stop the tsunami of psychological misthiving among children and young people: <https://bornsvilkar.dk/nyheder/stop-tsunamien-af-psykisk-mistrivsel-blandt-boern-og-unge/>



A report from UNICEF *Study of Danish schoolchildren's knowledge of human rights and the Convention of the Rights of the Child* published in September 2019, show that children and young people in Denmark accept violence, surveillance and torture. The report further reveals that almost twice as many young people between the age of 15 -25 years of age have used drugs within the past month compared to a similar study in 2014. The result shows that 24.600 young people are using drugs.

The survey is based on responses from over a thousand Danish pupils in 6th - 10th grade and shows:

- Every fifth (20%) thinks it is OK for the police to use torture in special cases. In addition, 30%, which is neither for nor against.
- More children and adolescents than before think it is okay for parents to physically punish their children. It now applies to 8 % (in addition, 7 % who neither agree nor disagree) while in 2014, only 3 % felt that parents should use physical punishment.
- The proportion of children and young people who think it is okay for the state to monitor citizens has increased from 4 % in 2017 to 11 % in 2019.

The study shows that it is only in the 9th grade that the children gain a greater knowledge of their rights. It is problematic that the children only attain knowledge of their rights when they are out of primary school¹⁶.

Recommendations

The Kingdom of Denmark lack compliance with international obligations and show severe disrespect towards the United Nation, which have the mandate to examine the state, and for the European Court of Human Rights. It is therefore recommended that UN Human Rights Council take all measures in hand to assist the Kingdom of Denmark in respecting international obligations on Human Rights.

¹⁶ Institution for Human Rights: <https://menneskeret.dk/nyheder/danske-boern-unge-accepterer-vold-overvaagning-tortur>