

# Contents

<i>List of Diagrams</i>	xxix
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xxxix
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	lxxvii

I. THEMES AND QUESTIONS	1
1. Introduction	5
A. Overarching Themes	7
1. Child abuse as a social and legal construction	7
2. The protection of the family as a private sphere	8
3. Child abuse and moral panics	9
4. A federation of agencies?	12
B. A Note on the Comparative Analysis of Other Jurisdictions	13
1. Canada	13
2. Australia	15
3. New Zealand	15
4. The United States	16
5. Scotland	17
II. THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR ADJUDICATING ALLEGATIONS	19
2. Family Law	21
A. Tracing the Influences on the Current Law	25
1. Scandals	25
2. Shifts in childcare policy	26
3. The European Convention on Human Rights and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child	28
B. The Principles of Family Law Relating to Child Protection	31
1. English law	31
(a) <i>The welfare principle</i>	32
(b) <i>A child/parent relationship is fundamental and lifelong</i>	34
(c) <i>Partnership between parent and state</i>	35
(d) <i>The state may only intervene once statutorily defined thresholds have been crossed</i>	36
(e) <i>Delay in decision making is bad for the child and should be avoided</i>	36
(f) <i>A court order is the last resort</i>	37
2. Principles of child protection law in the United States	38
3. Principles of child protection law in Canada	39



4. Principles of child protection law in Australia	41
5. Principles of child protection law in New Zealand	43
C. The Structure of English Family Law Legislation Relating to Child Protection	45
D. Offering Services to Children	48
1. Offering services to children in England and Wales	48
(a) <i>Defining 'in need'</i>	48
(b) <i>Services which may be offered under Part III</i>	49
2. Offering services in the United States	54
3. Offering services in Canada	56
4. Offering services in Australia	57
5. Offering services in New Zealand	58
6. Evaluation of the provision of services in jurisdictions	59
E. Granting a Court Order	59
1. Care or supervision orders in England and Wales	61
(a) <i>The threshold criteria</i>	62
(b) <i>Creating the significant harm standard</i>	62
(c) <i>'Satisfied'</i>	64
(d) <i>Is likely to suffer significant harm</i>	67
(e) <i>Attributing the harm or likelihood of harm to the care of the child</i>	69
(f) <i>Factors in the decision on whether to make an order</i>	73
(g) <i>The effects of a care or supervision order</i>	75
(h) <i>Interim care or supervision orders</i>	77
(i) <i>Duties of the local authority when looking after children</i>	77
(j) <i>Contact</i>	78
(k) <i>Additional powers under a care order</i>	79
(l) <i>Discharging a care or supervision order</i>	80
2. Court orders in the United States	80
3. Court orders in Canada	86
4. Court orders in Australia	88
5. Court orders in New Zealand	90
F. Monitoring State Care of a Child	93
1. Monitoring local authority care of a 'looked after' child in England and Wales	93
2. Monitoring state care of a child in the United States	100
G. Allegations of Child Abuse in Private Proceedings	103
1. Orders under the Children Act 1989	104
2. Making decisions in proceedings between family members in the United States	108
3. Making decisions in proceedings between family members in Canada	110
4. Making decisions in proceedings between family members in Australia	111
5. Making decisions in proceedings between family members in New Zealand	113
H. Evaluation—Has Family Law Struck the Right Balance?	116
3. Liability in Criminal Law	119
A. Tracing the Influences on the Current Law	121
1. The 'failure' of the criminal law in cases of child abuse	121
2. Fear of 'Paedophiles'	123



3. The European Convention on Human Rights and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child	126
B. Principles of Criminal Law	128
1. The harm principle	128
2. Liability for acting rather than failing to act	128
3. The subjectivist principle	129
4. Legal certainty	130
5. Presumption of innocence	131
C. Homicide	133
1. Murder	134
2. Manslaughter	138
(a) <i>Voluntary manslaughter</i>	138
(i) Provocation	138
(ii) Diminished responsibility	142
(b) <i>Involuntary manslaughter</i>	142
(i) Unlawful or dangerous act (constructive) manslaughter	142
(ii) Criticisms of the offence	143
(iii) Gross negligent manslaughter	145
3. Infanticide	146
4. Homicide law in the United States	148
(a) <i>Inferring an intention to kill in cases of prolonged abuse</i>	148
(b) <i>Homicide by abuse</i>	149
(c) <i>An infanticide offence or defence?</i>	150
5. Homicide law in Canada	151
(a) <i>Acts and omissions</i>	152
(b) <i>Causation</i>	153
(c) <i>Intention to cause death in cases of repeated abuse</i>	154
6. Homicide law in Australia	155
7. Homicide law in New Zealand	157
8. Establishing liability when the identity of the person who killed the child is not clear	158
(a) <i>The Law Commission proposals</i>	159
(i) Cruelty contributing to death	159
(ii) Failure to protect	160
(b) <i>The Domestic Violence, Crimes and Victims Act 2004</i>	163
(c) <i>Establishing liability in the United States</i>	166
(d) <i>Establishing liability in Canada</i>	168
(e) <i>Establishing liability in Australia</i>	172
(f) <i>Establishing liability in New Zealand</i>	174
9. Evaluation: killing by carers—has the law gone far enough?	176
D. Non-Fatal Offences Against the Person	177
1. Ill-treatment and neglect	178
2. Offences against the person	181
3. Psychiatric injury	183
4. Reasonable parental chastisement	185
5. Allowing physical chastisement in the United States	188



6. 'Justifiable force' in Canada	189
7. 'Reasonable chastisement' in Australia	191
8. 'Reasonable force' in New Zealand	191
E. Sexual Offences Against Children	192
1. Sexual offences in English Law: the Sexual Offences Act 2003	192
(a) <i>Offences against children under 13</i>	193
(b) <i>Sexual offences against children under the age of 16</i>	199
(c) <i>Meeting a child following sexual grooming</i>	202
(d) <i>Abuse of trust</i>	205
(e) <i>Familial sexual offences</i>	206
2. Sexual offences in the United States	207
3. Sexual offences in Canada	208
4. Sexual offences in Australia	211
5. Sexual offences in New Zealand	212
F. Evaluation—An Adequate 'Fit' Between Current Conceptions of Child Abuse and the Criminal Law?	213
<b>4. Liability in Tort and Human Rights Law</b>	<b>216</b>
A. Tracing the Influences on the Current Law	218
1. The objectives of suing in tort	218
(a) <i>To supplement or supplant criminal prosecution</i>	219
(b) <i>To 'empower' victims: tort law as therapy</i>	220
(c) <i>To make the abuser and the system within which he operated accountable to victims</i>	221
(d) <i>To expose the wider context of the alleged abuse to external scrutiny</i>	225
(e) <i>To obtain individuated compensation</i>	227
2. Some points on procedural issues	229
B. The Tort Liability of the Abuser	235
1. Liability in battery for physical and sexual abuse	235
(a) <i>Does battery require proof of fault?</i>	236
(b) <i>The issue of consent</i>	239
(i) Allocation of the burden of proof	239
(ii) Vitiating of consent	240
(c) <i>Negligent battery?</i>	244
(d) <i>Actionable harm</i>	245
(e) <i>Liability for unforeseen consequences</i>	245
2. Liability for intentional infliction of mental suffering	246
3. Liability in negligence for neglect	247
4. Evaluation: making tort law fit the reality of child abuse?	248
C. The Principles Relating to the Civil Liability of Third Parties who Fail to Protect a Child	248
1. Tort liability for omissions	248
2. The structure of liability in negligence	251
(a) <i>The initial premise</i>	252
(b) <i>The test for duty of care</i>	252
3. The structure of liability for breach of statutory duty	257



4. The structure of secondary liability	258
(a) <i>Vicarious liability</i>	258
(b) <i>Non-delegable duty</i>	259
5. Liability in equity: the Canadian experiment with fiduciary duty	261
D. The Tort Liability of the Passive Parent or Carer	262
1. A duty of care to protect from harm by a third party	263
(a) <i>A parental immunity doctrine?</i>	263
(b) <i>A duty to take positive action?</i>	267
2. Breach of the duty to protect	274
(a) <i>The level of culpable knowledge of the risk</i>	274
(b) <i>A subjectivized standard of care?</i>	276
3. Non-interference as causing harm to the child	279
4. Evaluation: victimizing victims?	280
E. Abuse in an Institutional Setting: the Tort Liability of a Party with a Legal Connection with the Abuser	282
1. The dynamics of abuse in an institutional setting	282
2. Primary liability in negligence	286
(a) <i>Negligence in hiring the abuser</i>	289
(b) <i>Negligence in failing adequately to train and supervise the abuser</i>	292
(c) <i>Negligence in dealing with complaints of abuse</i>	296
3. Vicarious liability for the intentional tort of the abuser	298
(a) <i>The conventional approach</i>	298
(b) <i>Rewriting the rules of vicarious liability: the Canadian policy-based approach</i>	299
(c) <i>Rewriting the rules of vicarious liability: the English response</i>	304
(d) <i>Rewriting the rules of vicarious liability: the Canadian shift towards rules</i>	306
(e) <i>Adhering to the orthodox rules of vicarious liability: the Australian response</i>	309
(f) <i>New Zealand law: avoidance of institutional care</i>	312
(g) <i>American law: a diversity of approaches</i>	312
4. Non-delegable duty	312
5. Abuse in an institutional setting: fixing blame	315
F. The Tort and Human Rights Liability of Child Protection Agencies	319
1. The evolution of civil liability of public authorities to compensate members of the public	321
(a) <i>Justiciability: threshold or fall-back?</i>	323
(b) <i>Common law negligence: converting a statutory discretion to act into a duty to act</i>	329
(i) <i>The negligence liability of investigatory agencies: weaving blanket immunity</i>	329
(ii) <i>The negligence liability of investigatory agencies: unravelling blanket immunity</i>	332
(iii) <i>The negligence liability of investigatory agencies in New Zealand</i>	339
(iv) <i>The negligence liability of investigatory agencies in Australia</i>	339
(v) <i>The negligence liability of investigatory agencies in Canada</i>	340
(vi) <i>The negligence liability of investigatory agencies in the United States</i>	341
2. Liability of child protection investigators to the child	346



(a) <i>Failure to investigate an abuse allegation</i>	346
(i) Breach of a statutory duty to investigate	347
(ii) Liability for negligent failure to investigate in New Zealand law	348
(iii) Liability for negligent failure to investigate in Australian law	349
(iv) Liability for negligent failure to investigate in Canadian law	350
(v) Liability for negligent failure to investigate in American law	351
(b) <i>Negligent investigation of an abuse allegation by social services</i>	356
(i) Liability of social services for negligent investigation in New Zealand law	356
(ii) Liability of social services for negligent investigation in English law	357
(iii) Liability of social services for negligent investigation in Canadian law	359
(c) <i>Negligent investigation of an abuse allegation by police child protection officers</i>	361
(i) Liability of police for negligent investigation in English law	361
(ii) Liability of police for negligent investigation in Canadian law	364
(iii) Liability of police for negligent investigation in Australian law	365
(d) <i>Negligent investigation of an abuse allegation by health professionals and health authorities</i>	366
(i) Misdiagnosis of abuse or neglect	367
(ii) Failure to report suspected abuse to the authorities	368
(iii) Immunity from civil liability for reporters of suspected abuse	371
(iv) Witness immunity	372
3. Liability of social services for failure to protect the interests of a child in care	374
(a) <i>Negligent placement or monitoring of a child with a foster family</i>	374
(i) Negligent placement or monitoring of a child in care in English law	374
(ii) Negligent placement or monitoring of a child in care in Canadian law	376
(iii) Negligent placement or monitoring of a child in care in New Zealand law	377
(iv) Negligent placement or monitoring of a child in care in Australian law	378
(v) Negligent placement or monitoring of a child in care in American law	379
(b) <i>Negligent placement of a dangerous child with a foster family</i>	381
(i) Negligent placement of a dangerous child with a foster family in English law	381
(ii) Negligent placement of a dangerous child with a foster family in Canadian law	383
(iii) Negligent placement of a dangerous child with a foster family in American law	383
(c) <i>Negligent management of a child in care</i>	385



4. Failure of a child protection agency to protect a child's human rights	387
(a) <i>Breach of the European Convention on Human Rights</i>	388
(i) Positive rights to protection	389
(ii) The standard required for a finding of breach of a positive obligation	391
(iii) Remedies for breaches of human rights	393
(b) <i>Liability under the Human Rights Act 1998</i>	394
5. Constitutional tort liability of child protection agencies in American law	396
(a) <i>A violation of a constitutional right</i>	397
(i) Creating a 'constitutional tort'	398
(ii) Circumventing <i>DeShaney</i> : a state-created or state-enhanced danger to a child as a substantive due process right	400
(iii) Circumventing <i>DeShaney</i> : affirmative duty arising from taking control of a child as a substantive due process right	402
(iv) Circumventing <i>DeShaney</i> : reliance on a procedural due process right	403
6. Liability of child protection investigators to the suspect	406
(a) <i>Liability in negligence</i>	406
(b) <i>Liability in the bad faith torts</i>	408
(c) <i>Liability in defamation</i>	409
7. Evaluation: is tort law the enemy or the instrument of effective child protection?	411
(a) <i>Liability for failing to act</i>	411
(b) <i>The human rights alternative</i>	412
(c) <i>Negligence liability and public policy: efficacious or pernicious?</i>	414
(i) 'Defensive practice' versus standard-setting for public services	414
(ii) Direct accountability versus opening the floodgates	415
(iii) Investing in child protection versus diversion of scarce resources	417
(iv) Constraining fears of liability: good faith qualified immunity	418

### III. THE INQUIRY PROCESS 423

5. Investigating and Evaluating Allegations of Abuse	425
A. Tracing the Influences on the Current English Guidance	428
1. Scandals	429
(a) <i>Child deaths</i>	429
(b) <i>Investigations into child sexual abuse</i>	430
(c) <i>Abuse and mismanagement in an institutional setting</i>	431
2. The influence of research and inspectorate reports	432
B. Dominant Themes of the Guidance for Investigators	434
1. Coordination, agreed procedure, and shared information	434
2. Partnership between parents and investigators	438
3. The involvement of children	440
C. The Procedures	441
D. Reporting Child Abuse	442
1. Reporting child abuse in England and Wales	443
(a) <i>Education</i>	443



(b) <i>Professional identification of child maltreatment</i>	444
(i) The nature of the concern that should be referred	445
(ii) Confidentiality	446
2. Reporting child abuse in New Zealand	449
3. Reporting child abuse in the United States	450
4. Reporting child abuse in Australia	452
5. Reporting child abuse in Canada	453
6. Evaluation: do mandatory reporting provisions help?	454
E. Responding to a Report	455
1. Starting an investigation in England and Wales	458
(a) <i>Children Act 1989 s 47 inquiry</i>	458
(b) <i>Other mechanisms for starting an inquiry by a local authority</i>	459
2. Gathering information	460
3. Starting an investigation in the United States	461
4. Starting an investigation in Canada	462
5. Starting an investigation in New Zealand	463
6. Starting an investigation in Australia	465
F. Protecting the Child Immediately	466
1. Separation without a court order in England and Wales	467
(a) <i>Removing the alleged abuser</i>	467
(b) <i>Undertakings</i>	468
(c) <i>Placing the child outside the home</i>	468
(d) <i>Using police protection powers</i>	469
2. Court orders in England and Wales	471
(a) <i>The emergency protection order</i>	471
(b) <i>Orders for the removal of the alleged abuser instead of the child</i>	475
(i) The development of exclusion orders	475
(ii) The content of exclusion orders	476
(iii) Occupation orders	477
3. Emergency protection in the United States	479
4. Emergency protection in Canada	481
5. Emergency protection in Australia	483
6. Emergency protection in New Zealand	484
7. Evaluation: is the need to protect children from unnecessary change valued sufficiently in emergency protection law?	485
G. Gathering Evidence from the Child	486
1. Facilitating an assessment	486
(a) <i>Child assessment orders</i>	487
(b) <i>Refusing to be examined</i>	489
2. Interviewing a child	490
(a) <i>Legal concerns about questioning techniques</i>	491
(i) Suggestibility	492
(ii) Interviewer bias	495
(iii) Multiple interviews	497
(iv) Use of props	498
(v) Protection from system abuse	499
(b) <i>The development of guidance for interviews to be used as evidence in civil family proceedings</i>	499



(c) <i>The development of guidance for interviews to be used as evidence in a criminal trial</i>	500
(d) <i>Content of the interview</i>	502
(e) <i>Interview protocols in the United States</i>	504
(f) <i>Interview protocols in other jurisdictions</i>	505
(g) <i>Evaluation—an example of procedure improving practice</i>	507
3. Medical examination	507
(a) <i>Guidance on medical examination in England and Wales</i>	507
(b) <i>The development of guidance in other jurisdictions</i>	509
H. Further Phases of the Child Protection Process	510
1. The child protection conference	510
(a) <i>Organization of the conference</i>	510
(b) <i>Parental and child involvement</i>	512
2. Family group conferences	513
3. Child protection mediation	516
4. The decision to apply for a civil order to protect the child	517
I. Further Phases of a Criminal Investigation	518
1. Interview with the suspect	518
2. The search for corroboration	520
3. The evaluation of the evidence collected	521
(a) <i>Application of the sufficiency of evidence test</i>	522
(b) <i>Application of the public interest test</i>	523
J. Evaluation: Legal Procedures to Guide the Inquiry Process: A Help or a Hindrance for Investigators?	524
 IV. ADJUDICATION OF THE ALLEGATION	 527
6. Introduction: Themes and Influences	529
A. Systems with Different Objectives?	531
B. Inquisitorial versus Adversarial Inquiries?	531
C. Free Proof versus Filtered Proof?	532
D. Visible Justice versus Invisible Justice?	533
E. System Abuse?	538
7. Access to Evidence	539
A. Disclosure of Evidence in Child Protection Proceedings	542
1. Disclosure by the local authority to the family	543
2. Disclosure by the family to the local authority or other investigators	546
B. Prosecution and Defence Disclosure of Evidence in Criminal Proceedings	548
1. Prosecution disclosure	548
(a) <i>Staged disclosure under the CPIA 1996 and the CJA 2003</i>	548
(b) <i>Treatment of 'sensitive material'</i>	549
(c) <i>Prosecution claims to public interest immunity</i>	549
2. Defence disclosure	551



C. Disclosure of Evidence in the Possession of Third Parties	552
1. Third party disclosure in English law	553
(a) <i>Disclosure to investigators and prosecutors of information possessed by the family court or a third party</i>	553
(b) <i>Disclosure to the defence of information possessed by a third party</i>	558
(i) Legal professional privilege	559
(ii) Confidentiality	559
(iii) The 'mere credibility' rule	560
(iv) Public interest immunity claims	561
(v) Two tests and two balancing acts?	562
2. Third party disclosure in American law	568
(a) <i>Access by an accused to child protection records</i>	568
(b) <i>Privilege for confidential relationships</i>	571
3. Third party disclosure in Canadian law	572
(a) <i>Disclosure in child protection proceedings</i>	572
(b) <i>The prosecution's obligation to obtain relevant information possessed by third parties</i>	574
(c) <i>Privilege for confidential relationships in civil and criminal proceedings</i>	574
(d) <i>Procedures for disclosure of confidential records in criminal proceedings</i>	577
4. Third party disclosure in Australian law	583
(a) <i>Pre-trial disclosure in criminal proceedings</i>	583
(b) <i>Public interest immunity</i>	584
(c) <i>Confidential communications</i>	584
(d) <i>Admissions and disclosures made in family mediation and therapy conferences</i>	585
(e) <i>Sexual assault communication privilege</i>	586
5. Third party disclosure in New Zealand law	589
(a) <i>Prosecution and defence disclosure in criminal proceedings</i>	589
(b) <i>The public interest and absolute class privilege</i>	589
(c) <i>Discretionary protection for confidentiality</i>	591
D. Access to Evidence: A Coherent System or Serendipity?	594
1. A privilege for social services records?	595
2. A privilege for counselling records?	595
8. The Child Witness	598
A. Testimonial Competence and Compellability	599
1. Testimonial competence and compellability in English law	599
(a) <i>Criminal cases</i>	599
(b) <i>Civil cases</i>	606
2. Testimonial competence and compellability in Australian law	607
3. Testimonial competence and compellability in Canadian law	609
4. Testimonial competence and compellability in New Zealand law	610
5. Testimonial competence and compellability in Scottish law	611
6. Testimonial competence and compellability in American law	612
7. Evaluation: should competence be incontestable?	613



B. Procedures for the Testimony of Child Witnesses	614
1. Tracing the influences on the current law	614
(a) <i>The international human rights context</i>	615
(b) <i>The background to reform in England and Wales</i>	618
(i) <i>The Pigot Report</i>	618
(ii) <i>The 1988 and 1991 Reforms</i>	618
(iii) <i>Problems with 'Half-Pigot'</i>	620
2. Special Measures Directions under the Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999	625
(a) <i>Eligibility for Special Measures</i>	629
(i) <i>Gateways to the Special Measures</i>	629
(ii) <i>Child witnesses 'in need of special protection'</i>	629
(b) <i>Optional Special Measures Directions</i>	631
3. Problematic Special Measures	633
(a) <i>The inflexible primary rule</i>	633
(i) <i>Mandatory admission of the video interview</i>	633
(ii) <i>Restrictions on supplementary examination-in-chief</i>	634
(iii) <i>Mandatory use of the videolink</i>	637
(b) <i>Pre-trial cross-examination</i>	638
(i) <i>The potential advantages of pre-trial videotaped testimony</i>	638
(ii) <i>The potential drawbacks of pre-trial videotaped testimony</i>	641
(iii) <i>Could 'full-Pigot' work? Lessons from other jurisdictions</i>	644
(iv) <i>Could pre-trial videotaped cross-examination work in England and Wales?</i>	657
(v) <i>Is 'full-Pigot' still needed?</i>	660
(c) <i>Intermediaries</i>	663
(d) <i>Mandatory application to defence child witnesses</i>	671
(e) <i>Exclusion of child defendants from Special Measures</i>	672
(f) <i>The challenge to Special Measures Directions under the Human Rights Act 1998</i>	675
4. Implementation of Special Measures Directions	679
5. Pause for a rethink: the Home Office review	684
6. Evaluation: can the adversarial trial provide justice for children?	684
9. Testing the Credibility of the Child Complainant	688
A. Corroboration Warnings	690
1. Corroboration warnings in English law	690
2. Corroboration warnings in Australian law	692
3. Corroboration warnings in Canadian law	694
4. Corroboration warnings in New Zealand law	695
5. Corroboration warnings in American law	695
6. Evaluation: law and practice in conflict?	696
B. Hearsay Evidence	698
1. The common law hearsay rule defined	698
2. The impetus for hearsay reform	705
3. Hearsay reform in English criminal cases	706
(a) <i>The admissibility of out-of-court statements by a non-witness</i>	707
(i) <i>The preserved common law exceptions</i>	707



(ii) Unavailable witnesses	708
(iii) Business documents	712
(iv) Judicial inclusionary discretion	713
(v) Exclusionary discretion?	714
(b) <i>The admissibility of hearsay statements by a witness</i>	715
4. Hearsay reform in English civil cases	716
5. Hearsay reform in Canadian law	718
(a) <i>Hearsay in Canadian criminal courts</i>	718
(b) <i>Hearsay in Canadian civil courts</i>	724
6. Hearsay reform in Australian law	725
(a) <i>Hearsay in Australian criminal courts</i>	725
(b) <i>Hearsay in Australian civil courts</i>	727
7. Hearsay reform in New Zealand law	727
8. Hearsay reform in American law	729
(a) <i>The constitutional dimension to the hearsay rule</i>	729
(b) <i>American hearsay reform at common law</i>	730
(c) <i>American hearsay reform by statute</i>	731
9. Evaluation: special admissibility rules for child hearsay?	735
C. 'Recent' and Delayed Complaint	737
1. Recent complaint in English criminal cases	737
(a) <i>The common law doctrine</i>	737
(b) <i>Application of the recent complaint doctrine to young complainants</i>	741
(c) <i>Statutory reform</i>	744
2. Recent complaint in English civil cases	745
3. Recent complaint in American law	745
4. Recent complaint in Canadian law	746
5. Recent complaint in New Zealand law	748
6. Recent complaint in Australian law	750
7. Recent complaint in South African law	752
8. Evaluation: a useful albeit illegitimate doctrine?	753
D. Character Evidence Pertaining to the Complainant	755
1. Evidence of bad character in English criminal cases	755
(a) <i>Admissibility at common law</i>	755
(b) <i>Statutory reform</i>	757
2. Evidence of bad character in English civil cases	759
3. Special protection for complainants in sexual assault cases: restrictions on cross-examination on previous sexual experience	760
(a) <i>Previous sexual experience in child abuse prosecutions in England and Wales</i>	762
(i) The statutory framework	762
(ii) Previous or subsequent allegations of sexual abuse made against third parties	767
(iii) Motive to fabricate the allegations against the defendant	774
(iv) Previous abuse to explain medical findings of sexual abuse	777
(v) Previous abuse or other sources to explain the child's precocious knowledge or sexualization	777
(b) <i>Previous sexual experience in child abuse prosecutions in Canadian law</i>	779
(i) The statutory framework	779



(ii) Previous or subsequent allegations of sexual abuse against third parties in Canadian law	782
(iii) Motive to fabricate the allegations against the defendant in Canadian law	785
(iv) Previous abuse to explain medical findings of sexual abuse or the child's premature sexualization in Canadian law	785
(c) <i>Previous sexual experience in child abuse prosecutions in American law</i>	786
(i) The statutory framework	786
(ii) Previous or subsequent allegations of sexual abuse against third parties in American law	787
(iii) Motive to fabricate the allegations against the defendant in American law	788
(iv) Previous abuse to explain medical findings of sexual abuse in American Law	788
(v) Previous abuse or other sources to explain the child's precocious knowledge or sexualization in American law	789
(d) <i>Previous sexual experience in child abuse prosecutions in Australian law</i>	790
(i) The statutory framework in Australian law	790
(ii) Previous or subsequent allegations of sexual abuse against third parties in Australian law	792
(iii) Motive to fabricate the allegations against the defendant in Australian law	793
(iv) Previous abuse to explain medical findings of sexual abuse	794
(v) Previous abuse or other sources to explain the child's precocious knowledge or sexualization in Australian law	794
(e) <i>Previous sexual experience in child abuse prosecutions in New Zealand law</i>	795
(i) The statutory framework in New Zealand law	795
(ii) Previous or subsequent allegations of sexual abuse against third parties in New Zealand law	796
(iii) Motive to fabricate the allegations against the defendant in New Zealand law	797
(iv) Previous abuse to explain medical findings of sexual abuse	798
(v) Previous abuse or other sources to explain the child's precocious knowledge or sexualization in New Zealand law	798
4. Evaluation: the credibility conundrum	799
<b>10. Testing the Credibility of the Alleged Abuser</b>	803
A. Evidential Uses of Character Evidence	804
B. The Defendant's Other Misconduct as Direct Proof of Guilt: Reasoning from Propensity in Criminal Cases	806
1. The procedural context	806
2. Balancing probative value and potential prejudicial effect	807
3. Models for controlling the admissibility of propensity evidence	813
4. Propensity or 'similar fact evidence' in English criminal law before the Criminal Justice Act 2003	814
(a) <i>The 'other purposes' model constructed</i>	814
(i) One approved purpose: 'background' evidence	817
(b) <i>The 'other purposes' model dismantled</i>	818
(c) <i>Probative value, collusion and unconscious contamination</i>	820



(d) <i>Propensity evidence in child physical abuse and homicide</i>	822
(e) <i>Joinder and severance of counts</i>	823
(f) <i>Propensity evidence and institutional abuse</i>	825
(g) <i>Propensity to comply with the law: good character evidence</i>	826
5. <i>Propensity evidence in American criminal law</i>	827
(a) <i>The 'other purposes' model in American law</i>	827
(b) <i>Propensity evidence to prove guilt in American law</i>	829
6. <i>Propensity evidence in Australian criminal law</i>	832
(a) <i>Admissibility of propensity evidence in Australian common law</i>	832
(b) <i>Admissibility of other misconduct evidence under Australian statutes</i>	833
(c) <i>'Relationship evidence' in Australian law</i>	837
(d) <i>The risk of collusion and unconscious influence in Australian law</i>	838
(e) <i>Joinder and severance of charges in Australian law</i>	839
7. <i>Propensity evidence in New Zealand criminal law</i>	841
(a) <i>Admissibility of propensity evidence in New Zealand common law</i>	841
(b) <i>Background evidence in New Zealand law</i>	842
(c) <i>Proposals for statutory reform of the New Zealand doctrine</i>	842
8. <i>Propensity evidence under Canadian criminal law</i>	843
(a) <i>The standard of proof on the voir dire in Canadian law</i>	847
(b) <i>Collusion and unconscious contamination in Canadian law</i>	847
(c) <i>Joinder and severance of counts in Canadian law</i>	848
C. <i>The Defendant's Previous Misconduct as Credibility Evidence in Criminal Cases</i>	849
1. <i>The first model: defendants lose their shield by choosing to testify</i>	850
2. <i>The second model: defendants retain their shield, subject to forfeiture</i>	852
D. <i>Radical Reform: Expanded Admissibility of Propensity and Credibility Evidence Under the Criminal Justice Act 2003</i>	854
1. <i>The new statutory model</i>	854
2. <i>Joinder and severance</i>	860
3. <i>The new statutory model: judicial interpretation</i>	860
E. <i>Propensity and Credibility Evidence in Civil Cases</i>	862
F. <i>Evaluation: An Irresolvable Conflict of Incommensurable Concepts?</i>	864
1. <i>The probative value of propensity evidence in child sexual abuse cases: a special rule?</i>	866
2. <i>Propensity evidence in child physical abuse and homicide</i>	868
3. <i>Collusion and contamination</i>	868
4. <i>Joinder of counts in a single trial</i>	869
11. <i>The Admissibility of Expert Evidence</i>	872
A. <i>General Principles</i>	873
1. <i>The legal questions</i>	873
2. <i>Expert qualifications</i>	874
B. <i>Expert Evidence Relating to Physical Signs of Abuse or Neglect</i>	875
C. <i>Expert Evidence Relating to Psychological Signs of Abuse or Neglect</i>	882
1. <i>Psychological behaviour as diagnostic evidence</i>	884
2. <i>Psychological behaviour as 'rehabilitative' evidence</i>	886
3. <i>Expert analysis of the child's disclosure</i>	887
4. <i>The admissibility of expert psychological evidence in English civil courts</i>	890



5. The admissibility of expert psychological evidence in English criminal courts	892
6. The admissibility of expert psychological evidence in American courts	895
7. The admissibility of expert psychological evidence in Canadian courts	899
8. The admissibility of expert psychological evidence in New Zealand courts	902
9. The admissibility of expert psychological evidence in Australian courts	906
10. The admissibility of expert psychological evidence in Scottish courts	908
11. Evaluation of behavioural science and the child witness	908
12. Behavioural psychology and the defendant: offender profiling	912
(a) <i>Offender profiling as prosecution evidence</i>	912
(b) <i>Offender profiling as defence evidence</i>	913
D. Evaluation: Is Expert Evidence Superfluous, Dangerous or Probative?	917

## V. CHILD ABUSE LAW AND POLICY: EVALUATION 923

12. Themes and Future Directions	925
A. Where the Law is Now	925
B. Points of Mismatch Between Legal Systems	927
C. Legal Doctrines Which Condone Stereotypes	928
D. Points of Mismatch Between Black Letter Law and Practice	931
E. Negative Effects of the Law on Practice	931
F. Future Directions	934
<i>Bibliography</i>	935
<i>Index</i>	975