

**Eleanor Gallagher**  
9 Thissell Street  
Prides Crossing, MA 01965

May 27, 1994

Mr. Longo  
Investigative Unit  
Saltinstall Building  
Boston, Massachusetts

**RE: Fred Emilianowicz, Jr.**  
**Case No. SW-94-002**

Dear Mr. Longo:

I wish to thank you and the members of the committee for the opportunity to present materials and appear before you on May 23, 1994 concerning the questionable treatment of my grandchildren by Mr. Emilianowicz.

It is my contention that Mr. Emilianowicz failed, neglected, and refused to thoroughly investigate claims made by daughter Holly Collins that her children Zachary and Jennifer had been sexually and physically by their father Mark. Mr. Emilianowicz took up Holly's cause in Court as an advocate and provided what purported to be expert opinion on the alleged abuse. Mr. Emilianowicz failed, refused and neglected to interview Mark Collins, despite his repeated requests and the fact that he held joint legal custody of the children. While being caught up in that and because of his failure to investigate properly, and as Holly's advocate, Mr. Emilianowicz failed to recognize the harm that Holly was causing her children. Because Mr. Emilianowicz was a willing participant, he perpetuated that harm. Specifically, Mr. Emilianowicz provided what ostensibly appeared to be expert opinion seeking to deny Court ordered visitation of the father which had the result of continuing Holly's mental abuse of the children.

At our meeting of May 23, 1994, the following questions were left unresolved:

**1. Did Mr. Emilianowicz knowingly refuse to supply Mr. Collins with information regarding his children to which Mr. Collins was legally entitled?**

I. The answer is yes. Mr. Collins clearly and concisely presented to Mr. Emilianowicz, in letter dated March 27, 1992, information indicating the potential harm Holly was inflicting on the children (Exhibit A), and attached to the letter were legal documents to support his claims which included the following Court Orders:

A. Copy of Minnesota Court Order dated October 2, 1990 stating

that Mr. Collins shared joint legal custody of his children which entitled him to obtain information related to his children's health care (Exhibit A1);

B. Court Order dated June 18, 1991 which **ORDERED THAT MARK COLLINS SHALL HAVE THE RIGHT TO OBTAIN INFORMATION DIRECTLY FROM HEALTH PROVIDERS TREATING HIS CHILDREN** (Exhibit A2);

C. Court Order dated February 28, 1992 which **INDICATED THAT HOLLY'S CARE OF THE CHILDREN WAS SUSPECT** (Exhibit A3):

*"The children's emotional and psychological health may be harmed if they continue in the physical care of {Holly}, if she continues to alienate them from {Mark} and deny visitation. There also exists concern that {Holly} overemphasizes and dwells on the children's medical status, to their detriment."*

*"{Holly} continues to make allegations that {Mark} provides a dangerous environment for the children during periods of visitation. All of {Holly's} current representations have been repeatedly addressed by this Court on numerous occasions. It appears that the children experience significant medical difficulties when they are in {Holly's} care and not {Mark's}."*

Mr Emilianowicz admitted in his letter to the Minnesota Court dated March 26, 1992 (Exhibit B) that he had refused contact with Mr. Collins:

*"Mr. Collins has attempted to contact me three times by telephone. I have not spoken to Mr. Collins because to do so would be a direct violation of client confidentiality."*

3. It is astonishing that Mr. Emilianowicz refused to supply Mr. Collins with information regarding his children even after receipt of the above-described Court document; whereas, the following list of Massachusetts health care providers promptly supplied Mr. Collins with information regarding his children after having received the identical legal documents that had been provided Mr. Emilianowicz. Such document was deemed by the Massachusetts Court as sufficient to obtain medical information:

Immunologist Dr. Alan Wang, Boston Children's Hospital; Psychiatrist Dr. Barbara Burr, Boston Children's Hospital; Chief Immunologist Dr. Polmar,

Boston Children's Hospital ; Psychiatrist Dr. Reimherr; Pediatrician Dr. Charles Loudon; Immunologist Dr. Hannaway; Psychologist Betty Sullivan, North Shore Children's Hospital; Psychologist Marjorie McDonald-Fult; Immunologist Dr. Yee, Tufts Medical Center.

**Mr. Emilianowicz refused contact with Mr. Collins or provide him information regarding his children until after April 22, 1992, more than two (2) months after his initial meeting with the children (Exhibit C: March 5, 1993 Minnesota Court Order, Pg. 1, para. 5) and due to Mr. Emilianowicz's willful disregard of information, the children remained in an abusive environment in the care of their mother Holly.**

I, too, attempted to contact Mr. Emilianowicz three times prior to my letter to his supervisor Ms. Kanter dated August 2, 1992. Mr. Emilianowicz received a copy of this letter from Ms. Kanter and had indicated that he did not feel a informative meeting was in order (Exhibit D).

**2. Did Mr. Emilianowicz have knowledge that the Minnesota Court suspected Holly of creating an abusive environment for the children during the time that they were in treatment with Mr. Emilianowicz and prior to the Minnesota Trial?**

1. Yes. Mr. Emilianowicz did received via mail legal from Mr. Collins documents which indicated that Holly's care of the children was suspect ( Exhibits A).

2. Mr. Emilianowicz was in communication with psychiatrist Dr. Reimherr during the time he treated Zachary and Jennifer Collins. On March 26, 1992, I wrote Dr. Reimherr and attached the February 28, 1992 Minnesota Court Order (Exhibit A3), as well as the following legal documents which one would expect were passed onto Mr. Emilianowicz when he assumed treatment of the children:

a. **Four (4) separate investigative reports by Minnesota Child Protective Division which indicated Holly's allegations that Mark had abused Jennifer and Zachary were unfounded.**

b. **New Hampshire Rockingham Superior Court Order dated October 1, 1991 clarifying a 1982 guardian ad litem report conducted at my request which indicated that Holly was not abused nor neglected as a child; an investigation that was conducted at my request after Holly's father petitioned for custody of Holly when she was seventeen years of age which refuted allegations that she had been abused by me as a child.**

After receipt of the above described legal documents, a health care provider should recognize that Holly was creating an unhealthy environment for her two minor children and it would be essential that Mr. Emilianowicz contact Mr. Collins.

3. It is fact that Mr. Emilianowicz did have the above information and numerous Court reports indicating that Holly's was potentially endangering the children by alienating them from their father (**legal grounds for reversal of custody**); over medicating the children; causing the children to falsely believe that they were sick and suffered numerous food allergies; pressuring doctors to prescribe drugs for the children by falsely reporting children's illnesses which resulted in Holly injecting the children with medications unnecessarily; causing the children severe mental anguish by brainwashing them into believing that they had been physically and sexually abused by their father, physically abused by their grandparents, and that Mark had sexually and physically abused their mother. I supplied the above described documents when I requested that Health and Educational Services, on August 2, 1992, to investigate Mr. Emilianowicz for his negligent treatment of my grandchildren and Mr. Emilianowicz was given copies of the documents according to his supervisor, Ms. Kanter.

Nevertheless, Mr. Emilianowicz, willfully and wantonly ignored all information provided him, as well as the December 22, 1992 extensive Findings of Fact from the Minnesota which stated that after a seven day trial, **THERE WAS OVERWHELMING EVIDENCE THAT HOLLY PLACED HER CHILDREN IN GREAT DANGER.** Yet, Mr. Emilianowicz continued to advocate for Holly by writing additional letters (Exhibit F) indicating:

"Nor did I have any reason to believe that they {Jennifer and Zachary} were being abused or neglected while they were in their mother's {Holly} care. Holly Ann, in my opinion, is a woman who has experienced a life time of abuse. I also believe that the children have been abused by their father."

Mr. Emilianowicz also stated that

"I wish to express my concern over the recent court ruling granting custody of the children to Mark Collins and limiting Holly Ann's contact with the children, to a two hour supervised visit once a week".

Based on the fact that the Court found that there was overwhelming evidence that Holly was abusing the children, it was appropriate that she be limited in her contact with the children as has been recommended by experts dealing with similar issues: (*Children Held Hostage: Dealing with programmed and brainwashed children. Clawar & Rivlin, American*

**Bar Association, 1991: pg. 105;148):**

**"If the degree of harm is assessed to be serious, sometimes the only method of intervention and healing is to remove the infectious agent...This may be accomplished through radically reducing custodial contact with the perpetrator. Or in extreme cases, it may involve awarding custody {of children} to the healthier, less hostile parent...In some cases, the positive changes that occur in the child are so radical that they are surprising to observe."**

When Zachary and Jennifer were removed from Holly's care, there was a radical improvement in their attitude, health, and mental wellbeing that has been well documented in guardian ad litem's reports to the Court.

Mr. Emilianowicz is a licensed social worker, practicing improved family functioning and should be aware of the literature, yet even with all this information available to him, he was either ignorant of treatment or willfully disregarded such materials.

The Minnesota Court took notice of the fact that Mr. Emilianowicz failed and refused to provide information to Mr. Collins and failed and refused, and neglected to receive information from Mr. Collins in several Court Orders (see Minnesota Orders dated December 1992; January 26, 1993; March 5, 1993):

**"The court again notes that Mr. Emilianowicz refused contact with {Mark}, therefore his opinion is not based on all available evidence.**

**3. Should Mr. Emilianowicz as a licensed, practicing social worker, working in improving family functioning, have recognized that Holly was endangering the mental and physical wellbeing of her children?**

I. Yes. By the time the children entered into therapy with Mr. Emilianowicz, the Minnesota Court, and doctors from Boston Children's Hospital had documented that the wellbeing of the children in Holly's care was suspect.

a. Psychiatrist Dr. Barbara Burr (Children's Hospital) stated in record dated December 11, 1991 that:

**"mother {Holly} is extremely preoccupied by her children's health issues, perhaps related to an acrimonious divorce. There is a sense of {Holly}**

**applying pressure to physicians to prescribe medications, assign diagnoses, label children as chronically ill”** (December 22, 1992 Minnesota Court Order, para. 29).

b. Chief Immunologist Dr. Polmar (Boston Children's Hospital) found that Zachary had no significant food allergies and no evidence of sensitivity to bee stings (ibid. para. 24.) Holly had been injecting Zachary with anti-bee venom herself and over medicating the children for alleged reactions to food allergies.

c. Jennifer was transferred to Boston Children's Hospital under emergency conditions for cyanotic attack where doctors found no organic reason for her condition. She had been treated for alleged similar attacks at the North Shore Children's Hospital with same findings.

d. At Holly request, the children were prescribed home portable oxygen tanks for alleged debilitating asthmatic condition prescribed by Dr. Hannaway who later wrote to the Minnesota Court indicating that the children were able to travel to Minnesota to visit their father.

e. Psychiatrist Dr. Reimherr treated Zachary for potentially suicidal thought on February 19, 1992.

f. Holly had been in psychiatric care since age fifteen for depression with Dr. McMilkensen.

g. Holly was in therapy with Ms. Susan Hyland in Massachusetts at the same time that the children were being treated by Mr. Emilianowicz. Records indicate that Holly was referred to Dr. Paul Rhudick for psychological evaluation (ibid., para 42). His test indicated,

“...pronounced obsessional trends characterized by introspection, deliberation and heavy reliance on fantasy. in {sic}addition, there are examples of some emotional liability and a tendency to use some hysterical features.” ...Holly is extremely sensitive to mild criticism and as a result she “often retreats into her own world of fantasy which is exceedingly complex.”

**All of the above cited information was available to Mr. Emilianowicz during the time he treated the children and he chose to ignore it, either by refusing to communicate with Mr. Collins or he never read the children's records.**

**4. Did Mr. Emilianowicz act responsibly by becoming Holly's self-appointed advocate when he wrote a letter directly to the Minnesota Court dated March 26, 1992, without copy to Mr. Collins, making specific recommendations as the children's purported expert counselor that :**

**"I do not believe that it is in the best interest of the children to visit their father in Minnesota".**

1. The children were suffering from severe mental abuse in the care of their mother Holly. She was programming/brainwashing them to hate their father, a father whom the children loved and who had never abused them. The children were isolated from their family especially from grandparents with whom they shared a very special relationship. Holly was also causing them physical abuse by over medicating them and injecting them unnecessarily with anti-bee venom, and convincing them that they had severe food allergies and subjecting them to a multitude of medical tests in order to find health care professionals gullible enough to champion her cause.

2. In the case of children being brainwashed/programmed, the worst recommendation would be to continue isolating the children from the target parent and allow them to remain in unsupervised contact with the programmer (Holly) according to *Children Held Hostage, dealing with programmed and brainwashed children* . Clawer & Rivlin, *American Bar Association*. 1991.

4. There was more evidence at the time Mr. Emilianowicz treated the the children in February to May, 1992 to suggest that they were being brainwashed by their mother Holly than there was evidence that the children were being abused by their father, i.e., the circumstances of the acrimonious divorce, continued unfounded accusations of abuse by the mother against the father, escalation of abuse allegation by Holly to eventually include alleged sexual abuse of a criminal nature by Mark, isolation, moving of children's residence, over-medicating the children; children's sudden fear of their father, children's chronic depression and suicidal ideation, children's spontaneous reporting of alleged abuse by father as noted in Mr. Emilianowicz's letter dated March 26, 1992, usage of unchildlike words, children missing 17 days of school in one school term in Massachusetts, over-enmeshment by Holly regarding the children's health issues, and complete isolation from family.

5. All Holly's allegations that Mark and his wife Rena abused drugs were unfounded as had been indicated by Court ordered drug tests and

psychological testing (ibid., para 38)

6. Mark and Rena underwent psychological evaluations ordered by the Minnesota Court. MMPI-2 tests indicated no evidence of major mental illness or major adjustment problems. Indications were that Mark is basically happy with his overall life situation and has a positive outlook for the future. He appeared trusting, honest, and responsive to needs of their people. (Minnesota Court order, December 22, 1992, para 39). Mark has always been gainfully employed, works as a research scientist, honorably discharged from the Air Force, and well respected by his coworkers. He has no criminal record.

7. Holly was always represented in Court, both in Massachusetts and Minnesota by multiple attorneys; whereas, Mark represented himself, i.e., pro se.

This was the information available to Mr. Emilianowicz while he was treating Zachary and Jennifer. Indications are that Mr. Emilianowicz had read the extensive Minnesota Court order dated either December 22, 1992 or the revised order dated January 26, 1993 according to the information in his letter to Holly's attorney dated February 5, 1993. That document included the unanimous decision by the Minnesota Court appointed professional who investigated the Collins case to remove the children from Holly's care and place them in the sole custody of their father. They included two guardians ad litem (both experienced lawyers who practiced family law), three (3) custody evaluators, psychiatrist Dr. Cline who had seen the children prior to the divorce, physicians including internist and immunologist, multiple psychologists, court investigator, and several social workers, all of whom independently concluded and testified at trial that Holly was endangering the lives of her children by mentally and physical abusing them by subjecting them to unnecessary medical treatment and by programming and brainwashing them to hate their father, as well as information provided by Massachusetts health professionals.

**It is well documented that after the children were removed from their mother's care, Zachary did not suffer any suicidal ideation nor has Jennifer suffered from cyanotic attacks. The children no longer take any medications. The children's school work is above average and reports from teachers are that both children appear much happier and interact well with their peers. Zachary and Jennifer have renewed their loving relationship with their father Mark.**

**If the Courts had acted on Mr. Emilianowicz's recommendations and left the children in the abusive care of their mother Holly, and a real possibility exists that Zachary**

could have committed suicide under those circumstances, who then would have been responsible?

Doesn't a licensed, practicing social worker have a responsibility to investigate facts regarding alleged physical and sexual abuse before making recommendations to a Court which may adversely impact the lives of his clients and that of the alleged perpetrator?

Doesn't a licensed, practicing social worker have an obligation to speak to the accused party who has joint legal custody of the children who are his clients?

Doesn't a licensed, practicing social worker have an obligation to his clients to ascertain truthfulness which impacts the clients own physical and mental wellbeing?

Did Mr. Emilianowicz meet the minimal standards for a licensed, social worker practicing in the area of improved family functioning? I think not!

Sincerely,

Eleanor Gallagher