Policy Focus: as usual, welcome or unwelcome reprieve from anything useful; Why?

- Because Policy problems

- Because You matter: BIC always at risk; Adoption has few friends few Organized, Powerful friends

Serving Vulnerable Children: Overwhelmingly important Adoption topic is this – bc tons of Vulnerable Children in world, and Adoption to degree we allow it serves their interests

Law-Policy Divide on Adoption today

- Many of us are lawyers, most likely think Law matters

- But Law often differs from Policy; in this area does for sure:

- Adoption law-policy divide domestic and international:
  - Law increasingly Adoption-friendly
  - Policy not necessarily following

- Why?
  - Law made fairly publicly, and publicly BIC often governs
  - Policy often made behind closed doors on high: BIC often ignored
RACIAL DISPROPORTIONALITY: Domestic Adoption issues (see your book for RD article)

- Law demonstrates Adoption-Friendly, Child-Friendly Progress: MEPA & ASFA

- Policy: the RD threat: not yet realized, but if we don’t act it will be

  - RD Movement: virtually all the powerful, moneyed players have bought in
  - Nature of Mvmt Goals: Reduce “RD” to achieve “Racial Equity”; ignore or misrepresent actual CAN rates; dangerous to blk kids
  - Impact: State Reports & leg; Congressional hearing looking toward RD Mvmt goal
  - Progressive claims re BIC and Larger Group
  - Misguided in terms of helping either Black Children or Black Community: instead should focus more on (1) Fostercare & Adoption for kids at major CAN risk, and (2) reducing actual CAN through radical changes in society and targeted HV type programs

UNPARENTED KIDS & INTERNATIONAL ADOPTION:
international issues

- Law again demonstrates Adoption-Friendly, Child-Friendly Progress: CRC, Hague, US law

- Policy: Actual IA law on-the-ground in diff countries, policy in diff countries, more Restrictive to net effect: by 2010 less than half the IA of 2004, and IA that exists worse for kids (older now)

  - Mvmt here: UNICEF and other official friends of kids, US
and other countries are responsible
– Again they claim Progressive Child Human Rights ground based on BIC & larger group of impoverished
– Again Misguided: BIC existing kids easy; and for larger group need radical anti-poverty policies – holding kids hostage to promote more fostercare, better institutions not a radical or truly progressive goal, not a good strategy to accomplish anything truly worthwhile like actually solving poverty and disease and war so birth parents can keep kids

– Alert you to 2 recent Policy Initiatives: both in IA Gl Pol piece (your Bk)
  – IA Policy Statement
  – Hearing before Inter-American Comm’n on Human Rights