

From: 5.1.2.e <5.1.2.e@gmail.com>
Date: Monday, August 10, 2026, 11:26 AM
To: postbus@eerstekamer.nl
 ek-secretariaat@eerstekamer.nl
CC: 5.1.2.e <5.1.2.e@gmail.com>
 Commissie J&V <cic.jv@tweedekamer.nl>
Subject: Noodzaak tot nationale en internationale opschaling in de aanpak van mensenhandel en systemen van kinderexploitatie

Attachments:

The Guardian August 4, 2026.pdf

Geachte leden van de Eerste Kamer der Staten-Generaal,

Met deze brief wil ik uw aandacht vragen voor een mondiale crisis die zich in stilte blijft uitbreiden: de internationale netwerken van mensenhandel en ernstige vormen van kinderexploitatie. De schaal, complexiteit en grensoverschrijdende aard van deze systemen overstijgen steeds vaker de mogelijkheden van maatschappelijke organisaties en individuele professionals.

Vanuit mijn betrokkenheid bij een internationaal netwerk dat zich inzet voor het ontmantelen van deze structuren, zien wij dat effectieve tegenwerking alleen mogelijk is wanneer nationale overheden actief deelnemen, informatie delen en ontwikkelingen vroegtijdig monitoren.

Zonder institutionele samenwerking is het vrijwel onmogelijk deze systemen daadwerkelijk te doorbreken.

In de afgelopen jaren heb ik herhaaldelijk signalen gedeeld met nationale en internationale (overheids)instanties. Deze signalen wijzen op patronen van georganiseerde exploitatie waarin financiële motieven, machtsstructuren en kwetsbare kinderen samenkomen. Burgers en maatschappelijke initiatieven zijn vaak de eersten die deze patronen tegenkomen, maar beschikken niet over de middelen om structureel in te grijpen.

In dit kader wil ik tevens wijzen op het feit dat artikel 31 van het Verdrag van Istanbul, dat voorschrijft dat huiselijk geweld verplicht moet worden meegewogen in beslissingen over gezag en omgang, in Nederland nog niet volledig is geïmplementeerd. Deze lacune vergroot de kwetsbaarheid van kinderen en beschermende ouders binnen het familierecht en onderstreept de noodzaak tot verdere wettelijke afstemming op internationale verplichtingen.

Gezien de rol van de Eerste Kamer in het bewaken van verdragsnaleving en wetgevingskwaliteit, verzoek ik u vriendelijk dit aspect mee te nemen in uw bredere beoordeling.

Gezien uw taak om de kwaliteit, uitvoerbaarheid en internationale samenhang van wetgeving te bewaken, verzoek ik u respectvol om:

- dit onderwerp opnieuw en integraal op de agenda te plaatsen;
- te onderzoeken hoe Nederland kan aansluiten bij internationale taskforces die aantoonbaar succesvol zijn in de bestrijding van mensenhandel;
- te beoordelen hoe vroegtijdige samenwerking tussen overheid, opsporing en maatschappelijke netwerken kan worden versterkt;
- te waarborgen dat signalen van burgers en professionals niet verdwijnen binnen institutionele systemen, maar leiden tot een toetsbare en verantwoorde opvolging.

De urgentie is hoog. De schade is immens. En de verantwoordelijkheid om kinderen te beschermen is universeel.

Voor verdere verdieping in de mechanismen achter mensenhandel, relationele exploitatie en institutionele blinde vlekken verwijs ik naar relevante literatuur, waaronder:

- 5.1.2.e – De prijs van het vuur
- 5.1.2.e – Kwaadaardig & Schijnveilig
- 5.1.2.e – Click. Stalk. Destroy.

- Bijlagen van Manifest of Peace (5.1.2.e)'s Mensifest en 5.1.2.e's flipbook)
- 5.1.2.e - Liefdevol Politiek Leiderschap
- Mijn publieke analyses op LinkedIn (profiel: 5.1.2.e)
- Manifestofpeace.org en Manifestofpeace.nl welke wij 16 juni 2026 via een petitie indienden bij de vaste Kamercommissie voor het Ministerie van Justitie en Veiligheid heb via de voorzitter J. Eerdmans en de vervangend voorzitter dhr. E. Prickaert, als vervolg op onze petitie tegen geweld d.d. 20 januari 2026.

Daarna hebben wij diverse commissies aangeschreven, in totaal elf, evenals The Guardian, om de internationale verbanden te delen die wij zien tussen ondermijnende criminaliteit in sectoren buiten de vijf domeinen die twee jaar geleden door het SKC-OC in opdracht van het Ministerie van Justitie en Veiligheid zijn onderzocht (Zorg, Vastgoed, Horeca, Transport en Detailhandel). Het SKC-OC waarschuwde destijds dat deze verwevenheid kan leiden tot een "staat in een staat".

Als internationaal netwerk hebben wij zeven aanvullende sectoren geïdentificeerd waarin vergelijkbare patronen zichtbaar worden:

- Sport en leisure
- Kinderrecreatie
- Telecom
- Financiële dienstverlening
- Juridische dienstverlening
- Journalistiek
- Politiek

Hieronder treft u de relevante correspondentie van de afgelopen periode aan.

Indien gewenst kan ik uiteraard alle signalen en documenten aanleveren die in de afgelopen jaren zijn ingediend bij verschillende ministeries en internationale organisaties.

Met waardering voor uw inzet, en in de hoop dat Nederland hierin een leidende rol zal vervullen,

Hoogachtend,

5.1.2.e

5.1.2.e

Van: 5.1.2.e <5.1.2.e@gmail.com>

Datum: 09-08-2026 09:22 (GMT+01:00)

Aan: Commissie J&V <cie.jv@tweedekamer.nl>, cie.biza@tweedekamer.nl, cie.fin@tweedekamer.nl, cie.szw@tweedekamer.nl, cie.vws@tweedekamer.nl, cie.buza@tweedekamer.nl, cie.eu@tweedekamer.nl, cie.bho@tweedekamer.nl, griffielB@tweedekamer.nl, cie.DiZa@tweedekamer.nl

Cc: 5.1.2.e <5.1.2.e@gmail.com>

Onderwerp: Urgente noodzaak tot nationale en internationale opschaling in de bestrijding van mensenhandel en kinderexploitatiesystemen

Geachte leden van de vaste Kamercommissies,

Met deze brief wil ik uw aandacht vragen voor een wereldwijde crisis die zich in stilte uitbreidt: de internationale netwerken van human trafficking, gecombineerd met ernstige vormen van kinderexploitatiesystemen. De schaal, complexiteit en grensoverschrijdende aard van deze netwerken overstijgen inmiddels de capaciteit van maatschappelijke organisaties en individuele professionals.

Ik schrijf u vanuit mijn betrokkenheid bij een internationaal netwerk dat zich met hart en ziel inzet voor het doorbreken van deze structuren. Wij zien dat effectieve bestrijding alleen mogelijk is wanneer internationale en nationale overheden actief betrokken zijn, informatie delen en vroegtijdig meekijken. Zonder internationale institutionele samenwerking blijft het vrijwel onmogelijk om deze systemen te ontmantelen.

In de afgelopen jaren heb ik herhaaldelijk signalen gedeeld met verschillende instanties, zowel nationaal als internationaal, alsmede de Nederlandse overheid. Deze signalen wijzen op patronen die duiden op georganiseerde uitbuiting, waarbij financiële motieven, machtsstructuren en kwetsbare kinderen samenkomen. Ik zie dat burgers en maatschappelijke initiatieven vaak als eerste geconfronteerd worden met deze patronen, maar dat zij onvoldoende middelen hebben om

structureel in te grijpen. Ook dwingende controle achter de voordeur en de ondermijnende criminaliteit, zoals onderzocht door het SKC-OC in opdracht van het Ministerie van Justitie en Veiligheid zijn hierop van grote invloed. Wij gaven 7 aanvullende sectoren aan, te weten: Sport en leisure, kinderrecreatie, telecom, financiële dienstverlening, juridische dienstverlening (o.a. artikel 31 van het Verdrag van Istanbul mist wat onze kinderen zou moeten beschermen), journalistiek en politiek.

Daarom vraag ik de kametcommissies vriendelijk doch enigszins dringend:

- om deze problematiek opnieuw en integraal te agenderen;
- om te onderzoeken hoe Nederland kan aansluiten bij internationale taskforces die zich met succes richten op mensenhandel;
- om te bezien hoe vroegtijdige samenwerking tussen overheid, opsporing en maatschappelijke netwerken kan worden versterkt;
- om te waarborgen dat signalen vanuit burgers en professionals niet tussen de systemen verdwijnen, maar leiden tot een toetsbare respons.

De urgentie is uitzonderlijk hoog, mede gezien de recente en alarmerende internationale signalen, waaronder ontwikkelingen in de Verenigde Staten. De maatschappelijke en menselijke schade is immens. De verantwoordelijkheid om kinderen te beschermen overstijgt politieke en nationale grenzen.

Indien Nederland nu niet tijdig en gecoördineerd handelt, dreigt een situatie waarin de risico's voor kwetsbare groepen verder escaleren. Het is van groot belang dat wij als land onze verantwoordelijkheid nemen en voorkomen dat deze ontwikkelingen zich hier kunnen verankeren.

Ter context treft u als bijlage een eerdere internationale melding d.d. 4 augustus 2026 aan, gericht aan The Guardian, waarin de noodzaak van overheidsbetrokkenheid bij de bestrijding van mensenhandel is toegelicht.

Voor een beter begrip van de mechanismen achter mensenhandel, relationele exploitatie en institutionele blinde vlekken verwijs ik naar relevante literatuur, waaronder:

- 5.1.2.e - De prijs van het vuur
- 5.1.2.e - Kwaadaardig & Schijnveilig
- 5.1.2.e - Click. Stalk. Destroy.
- Liefdevol Politiek Leiderschap - 5.1.2.e
- Mijn eigen publieke analyses op LinkedIn (profiel: 5.1.2.e 5.1.2.e)
- Bijlagen van Manifest of Peace (5.1.2.e)'s Mensifest en 5.1.2.e's flipbook)
- Manifestofpeace.org en Manifestofpeace.nl

Met waardering voor uw inzet en in de hoop dat Nederland hierin een leidende rol wil vervullen,

Hoogachtend,

5.1.2.e

5.1.2.e

Van: 5.1.2.e <5.1.2.e@gmail.com>

Datum: 04-08-2026 00:29 (GMT+01:00)

Aan: 5.1.2.e @theguardian.com

Cc: 5.1.2.e <5.1.2.e@gmail.com>

Onderwerp: The Hidden Architecture of Coercive Control: A Global Human Rights Failure

Dear Editors,

I am submitting a long-form investigative piece that reframes coercive control as a global human rights issue rather than a private relationship problem. Drawing on emerging research, survivor testimony and structural analysis, the article reveals how coercive control mirrors the power dynamics found in child abuse, human trafficking and organised exploitation, not because the harms are identical, but because they rely on the same systemic vulnerabilities.

The investigation introduces a new analytical model, PTTSFFMC SS, which maps eight interconnected domains of subjugation: psychological, technological, toxicological, sexual, financial, force-based, medical and cybercrime. This all for power, control and money motives. The addressee points out the motives Serial Bullying and Sadism. This framework shows

how coercive control escalates when multiple vulnerabilities converge, and why incident-based approaches consistently fail to recognise the architecture of harm.

A central finding is that lived experience is treated as anecdote rather than structural data. Survivors describe patterns of digital surveillance, economic restriction, social isolation and institutional blind spots with remarkable consistency, yet these insights rarely inform policy or institutional reform. The article argues that lived experience constitutes a missing dataset essential for understanding coercive control.

The attached framework also includes recent Dutch findings on systemic vulnerabilities in sectors linked to undermining criminality, as well as additional categories identified through survivor networks. These insights have been formally submitted to national authorities and are currently under review, illustrating how structural blind spots in institutions can reinforce the very patterns they aim to prevent.

The piece also presents the Manifest of Peace (Manifestofpeace.org), an emerging framework that integrates survivor insight with scientific research and positions coercive control within global human rights discourse. It calls for a shift from fragmented interventions to integrated protection systems capable of recognising patterns rather than isolated incidents.

This story aligns strongly with The Guardian's reporting on gender-based violence, trafficking, extremism, systemic injustice and institutional failure. It offers a new lens for understanding coercive control at a moment when governments worldwide are reconsidering their legal and institutional responses to non-physical forms of abuse. I believe this investigation will resonate with your international readership and contribute meaningfully to ongoing discussions about autonomy, safety and structural reform.

I would be glad to provide further context or discuss the piece in more detail. Should you have interest, our international network is available to offer additional insights drawn from years of lived experience, survivor testimony and cross-border conversations with those affected by coercive control worldwide. The full analytical framework is included as an attachment for your reference.

Please feel free to use any part of the supplied material into your reporting, protecting the children of our future begins with recognising the structures that endanger them.

With peace, love and hope,

5.1.2.e

5.1.2.e 5.1.2.e 5.1.2.e

5.1.2.e

5.1.2.e

The Netherlands

Tel. 5.1.2.e

Geachte leden van de overige Kamercommissies., Graag breng ik u onder de aandacht dat ik op 14 juli 2026 een uitgebreide en urgente correspondentie heb gestuurd aan de Commissie Justitie en Veiligheid. In deze email heb ik de meest recente versies van het Manifest of Peace gedeeld, evenals een reeks nationale en internationale ontwikkelingen die direct raken aan de bescherming van burgers, de rechtsstaat en de veiligheid van kinderen.

Omdat de inhoud van deze correspondentie meerdere beleidsdomeinen raakt, acht ik het noodzakelijk dat ook uw commissie kennisneemt van deze informatie. De thema's die aan bod komen, waaronder ondermijnende criminaliteit, technologische beïnvloeding, internationale mensenrechtenvraagstukken, de rol van journalistiek en politiek, en de bescherming van kinderen, vallen binnen de bredere verantwoordelijkheid van meerdere Kamercommissies.

Ik verzoek u daarom vriendelijk doch dringend om de verzonden email aan de Commissie Justitie en Veiligheid hieronder te bestuderen en te bezien welke onderdelen relevant zijn voor uw eigen werkterrein. De urgentie van deze onderwerpen is groot, en de samenhang tussen de verschillende sectoren vraagt om een gecoördineerde, interdisciplinaire aanpak.

Voor uw gemak verwijst ik u naar dezelfde bronnen, links en documentatie die ik eerder heb gedeeld, waaronder:

- Het Manifest of Peace (Nederlands en Engels)
- Relevante internationale ontwikkelingen
- Onderzoeksrapporten en publieke bronnen
- De verwijzingen naar misstanden die in meerdere sectoren zichtbaar worden wereldwijd

De bescherming van onze rechtsstaat en onze kinderen vereist gezamenlijke verantwoordelijkheid. Ik vertrouw erop dat u deze informatie met de nodige ernst en urgentie zult behandelen.

Dank u wel voor uw aandacht.

Met hoopvolle groet,

5.1.2.e

Flinders of Hope Foundation

5.1.2.e

www.flindersofhope.org

Flindersofhope@gmail.com

<https://whydonate.com/fundraising/rainbowribbonworldwide>

----- Oorspronkelijk bericht -----

Van: [redacted] <flindersofhope@gmail.com>

Datum: 15-07-2026 10:12 (GMT+01:00)

5.1.2.e [redacted] <@tweedekamer.nl> cie.fin@tweedekamer.nl cie.szw@tweedekamer.nl cie.vws@tweedekamer.nl

Cc: Commissie J&V <cie.jv@tweedekamer.nl>

Onderwerp: FW: RE: Manifest of Peace - petitie 16-6-2026

Geachte leden van de overige Kamercommissies,

Graag breng ik u onder de aandacht dat ik op 14 juli 2026 een uitgebreide en urgente correspondentie heb gestuurd aan de Commissie Justitie en Veiligheid. In deze email heb ik de meest recente versies van het Manifest of Peace gedeeld, evenals een reeks nationale en internationale ontwikkelingen die direct raken aan de bescherming van burgers, de rechtsstaat en de veiligheid van kinderen.

Omdat de inhoud van deze correspondentie meerdere beleidsdomeinen raakt, acht ik het noodzakelijk dat ook uw commissie kennisneemt van deze informatie. De thema's die aan bod komen, waaronder ondermijnende criminaliteit, technologische beïnvloeding, internationale mensenrechtenvraagstukken, de rol van journalistiek en politiek, en de bescherming van kinderen, vallen binnen de bredere verantwoordelijkheid van meerdere Kamercommissies.

Ik verzoek u daarom vriendelijk doch dringend om de verzonden email aan de Commissie Justitie en Veiligheid hieronder te bestuderen en te bezien welke onderdelen relevant zijn voor uw eigen werkteerrein. De urgentie van deze onderwerpen is groot, en de samenhang tussen de verschillende sectoren vraagt om een gecoördineerde, interdisciplinaire aanpak.

Voor uw gemak verwijs ik u naar dezelfde bronnen, links en documentatie die ik eerder heb gedeeld, waaronder:

- Het Manifest of Peace (Nederlands en Engels)
- Relevante internationale ontwikkelingen
- Onderzoeksrapporten en publieke bronnen
- De verwijzingen naar misstanden die in meerdere sectoren zichtbaar worden wereldwijd

De bescherming van onze rechtsstaat en onze kinderen vereist gezamenlijke verantwoordelijkheid. Ik vertrouw erop dat u deze informatie met de nodige ernst en urgentie zult behandelen.

Dank u wel voor uw aandacht.

Met hoopvolle groet,

5.1.2.e

Flinders of Hope Foundation

5.1.2.e

www.flindersofhope.org

Flindersofhope@gmail.com

<https://whydonate.com/fundraising/rainbowribbonworldwide>

----- Oorspronkelijk bericht -----

Van: [redacted] <flindersofhope@gmail.com>

Datum: 14-07-2026 10:04 (GMT+01:00)

Aan: Commissie J&V <cie.jv@tweedekamer.nl>

Cc: [redacted] <rainbowribbonworldwide@gmail.com>

Onderwerp: RE: Manifest of Peace - petitie 16-6-2026

Geachte Kamercommissie,

In aanvulling op mijn e-mails van 28 juni 2026, 1 juli 2026 en 11 juli 2026 stuur ik u hierbij de meest recente versies van het Manifest of Peace, zowel in het Nederlands als in het Engels.

We only can if we organize ourselves, consolidate the information, see through the chaos and structure what we see, with love and by loving people who refuse to look away, for the peace we all, or almost all, dream of.

Knowledge = power → A reminder that awareness is the first step toward change

Sharing = caring → Once we know, we have a duty to connect and support others

Looking away = complicity → The sharpest line, calling out silence as participation in harm

#ConnectTheDots #Please

#SaveOurChildren #SaveOurWorld

#BecauseWeHaveTheResponsibility

Daarnaast wijs ik u als Kamercommissie erop dat wij als team overwegen een internationale mensenrechtenclaim in te dienen tegen regeringen die er niet in slagen hun burgers te beschermen, maar hen juist blootstellen aan schade, misleiding of systemische ondermijning. Dit betreft een groeiende internationale zorg en sluit aan bij de thema's die in het Manifest of Peace worden benoemd. Het eerste gesprek met ^{5.1.2.e} is hierover al geweest, de voorbereidingen zijn in volle gang.

Wij vertrouwen erop dat de Kamercommissie deze correspondentie met de nodige urgentie en ernst behandelt en de maatregelen treft die noodzakelijk zijn om de Nederlandse rechtsstaat te beschermen en te laten voortbestaan. Het is essentieel dat Nederland niet afglijdt naar de niveaus die wij momenteel zien in andere landen, waar rechtsstatelijke principes onder druk staan.

De tijd voor daadwerkelijke, effectieve maatregelen is aangebroken. Alleen de overheid kan deze verantwoordelijkheid dragen en uitvoeren.

Dank u wel voor uw aandacht.

Met hoopvolle groet,

^{5.1.2.e}

Flinders of Hope Foundation

^{5.1.2.e}

www.flindersofhope.org

Flindersofhope@gmail.com

<https://whydonate.com/fundraising/rainbowribbonworldwide>

Dear reader,

This document presents a new systemic framework for understanding coercive control as a global human rights issue. It integrates lived experience, scientific research and structural analysis. I am sharing this with you because your expertise and perspective are valuable in refining and positioning this work for international publication. Any feedback, critique or endorsement is deeply appreciated.

Across the world, a silent architecture of coercive control is shaping the lives of millions. It is a form of violence that rarely leaves visible marks, yet its impact reaches far beyond the private sphere. Its mechanisms; psychological, technological, toxicological, sexual, financial, force (both mental and physical), medical manipulation and cybercrime (digital dragnet) in all social layers of our society are more and more becoming structural problematic, and they mirror the same worldwide dynamics seen in child abuse, trafficking and organised exploitation or so called submission for power, control, money, sadism or serial bullying.

Survivors have been describing this architecture for years, even decades.

Researchers are beginning to map it. But institutions, international courts and governments worldwide still struggle to recognise the patterns that bind these forms of harm together.

1. What Coercive Control Really Is

Coercive control is not an incident, not a conflict, not a relationship problem and not a private dispute. It is a systematic form of subjugation that stretches across psychological, social, digital, economic and sometimes toxicological domains. Over the past decade, many researchers worldwide have emphasised that this form of violence is not defined by physical harm, but by the gradual erosion of autonomy.

In many countries, coercive control is still treated as a “relationship issue”, when in reality it is a power structure that mirrors the same dynamics seen in child abuse, human trafficking and other forms of exploitation.

It involves dependency, isolation, information asymmetry, intimidation, manipulation and the

strategic use of resources to control another person.

Coercive control is therefore not a private matter but a worldwide systemic and institutional failure. It is a form of violence that thrives in systems that were never designed to recognise subjugation.

2.The Eight Forms of Subjugation: the PTTSFFMC SS model

Although coercive control is often described as psychological abuse, that is only one part of a much broader mechanism. Emerging models, including the PTTSFFMC SS framework, show that subjugation manifests through multiple, mutually reinforcing domains:

Psychological Subjugation – gaslighting, intimidation, dependency, fear conditioning.

Technological Subjugation – digital surveillance, device manipulation, online isolation.

Toxicological Subjugation – substance use, forced intoxication, chemical influence.

Sexual Subjugation – reputational harm, isolation, manipulation of social networks.

Financial Subjugation – economic dependency, debt, control over resources.

Force Subjugation – both mentally as physically starting from manipulation through young children, family, traditions or loyalty.

Medical Subjugation – restriction of physical freedom, control over movement, medical manipulation

Cybercrime Subjugation – using modern technology to influence norms, stigma, religious or cultural pressure.

The SS part of the model emphasises the motivation serial bullying and sadism, institutional blind spots, systemic failures, bureaucratic vulnerability.

The other motivations are power, control and money.

Together, these domains form an architecture of subjugation that affects not only individuals but entire communities and systems. The PTTSFFMC SS model reveals that coercive control is not a relational dynamic but a multidimensional power structure that appears across the globe

3. Subjugation and Undermining: The Twelve

System Vulnerabilities

The dynamics of coercive control show striking parallels with the mechanisms described in undermining criminality. Not because individual relationships constitute criminal networks, but because power structures are universal.

Researchers and commissions identify twelve recurring vulnerabilities that enable abuse, exploitation and subjugation:

- dependency
- intimidation
- information asymmetry
- isolation
- economic pressure
- social control
- digital manipulation
- bureaucratic blindness
- lack of oversight
- lack of knowledge
- lack of time of integrated cooperation

These vulnerabilities appear in:

- families

- institutions**
- child protection systems**
- national and international courts**
- migration systems**
- online environments**
- economic structures**

When these vulnerabilities converge, they create an environment in which coercive control can escalate into forms of harm that resemble the dynamics of child abuse and human trafficking, not because the situations are identical, but because the architecture of power is comparable.

4. How Subjugation Mirrors the Dynamics of Child Abuse

The architecture of coercive control does not only resemble the dynamics of adult partner abuse; it mirrors the mechanisms seen in child abuse. In both contexts, harm is not defined by physical injury but by the strategic erosion of autonomy. Children are made vulnerable through dependency, isolation, fear conditioning and the manipulation of trust, the same mechanisms that underpin coercive

control in adult relationships.

Research across child protection systems shows that perpetrators often rely on predictable vulnerabilities: limited mobility, economic dependence, emotional attachment, and institutional blind spots.

These vulnerabilities are not unique to childhood. Adults experiencing coercive control frequently describe the same structural constraints, restricted movement, financial surveillance, social isolation, and a lack of institutional recognition.

This overlap does not imply equivalence between child abuse and partner subjugation. Instead, it reveals a shared power architecture: a system in which one person gains control by exploiting dependency and institutional gaps. Understanding this architecture is essential for recognising how coercive control escalates and why it remains invisible to many professionals.

5. The Parallels with Human Trafficking

Human trafficking is often framed as an extreme and distant crime, a violation that happens in hidden networks, across borders, or in criminal

economies. Yet the mechanisms that enable trafficking are not confined to those contexts. They are rooted in the same structural vulnerabilities that allow coercive control to flourish: dependency, isolation, information asymmetry, economic pressure, and the strategic use of fear.

Trafficking victims frequently describe being controlled through:

- confiscated documents
- restricted movement
- debt bondage
- digital surveillance
- manipulation of social networks
- threats to family
- institutional blind spots

These mechanisms are not exclusive to trafficking. They appear in domestic abuse cases, in coercive relationships, and in situations where partners use economic, social or digital tools to restrict autonomy.

The parallel is not that coercive control is

trafficking.

The parallel is that both forms of harm rely on the same structural weaknesses in society.

When institutions fail to recognise these weaknesses, when courts focus on incidents instead of patterns, when child protection systems overlook digital manipulation, when migration systems ignore economic coercion, the architecture of harm remains intact. This is why survivors often describe coercive control as "a slow form of captivity".

Not because they are trafficked, but because the mechanisms of control are structurally similar.

6. When System Vulnerabilities Converge: The Escalation of Harm

Across countries, survivors report that coercive control escalates when multiple system vulnerabilities converge. These vulnerabilities, economic dependency, bureaucratic blind spots, digital surveillance, social isolation, and institutional fragmentation, create an environment in which perpetrators can operate with little resistance.

In interviews and research, survivors describe how:

- digital tools were used to monitor their movements**
- financial decisions were restricted or manipulated**
- social networks were systematically eroded**
- institutions failed to recognise patterns of harm**
- professionals focused on incidents instead of structures**
- bureaucratic processes delayed protection**
- toxicological influence blurred their ability to seek help**

When these vulnerabilities align, coercive control can intensify into forms of harm that resemble the dynamics of child abuse and trafficking. Not because the situations are identical, but because the power architecture is the same: a system in which autonomy is gradually dismantled through multiple, reinforcing mechanisms.

This convergence explains why survivors often say that the most damaging part of coercive control is not the behaviour of the perpetrator alone, but the failure of institutions to recognise the architecture of harm. When systems do not see the pattern, the

pattern becomes stronger.

7. When Institutions Fail: The Blind Spots That Sustain Harm(

Across countries, institutions tasked with protecting victims of abuse often struggle to recognise coercive control. Police forces are trained to respond to incidents, not patterns. Courts rely on evidence of physical harm, even when psychological and economic subjugation have already dismantled a victim's autonomy. Child protection agencies frequently focus on parental conflict rather than the architecture of coercion that shapes a child's environment. Migration systems, shelters and social services operate in silos, each seeing only fragments of a larger structure. These blind spots are not accidental. They are built into systems that were designed decades ago, long before digital surveillance, toxicological influence or financial manipulation became common tools of control. Interviews with survivors show that many were asked to recount isolated events rather than describe the pattern that governed their daily lives. Professionals often lacked the time, training or

frameworks to understand how coercive control escalates.

This institutional fragmentation creates a dangerous paradox: the more complex the architecture of harm becomes, the less likely it is to be recognised. Survivors frequently report that the most devastating part of coercive control was not the behaviour of the perpetrator alone, but the failure of institutions to see the structure of the abuse. When systems do not recognise the pattern, the pattern becomes stronger.

8. Lived Experience as the Missing Dataset

For decades, survivors have been describing the architecture of coercive control with remarkable clarity. They speak of psychological erosion, digital monitoring, financial restriction, social isolation and institutional blind spots. Yet their accounts are often treated as anecdotal rather than analytical, as personal stories rather than data. This is a critical oversight. Lived experience is not evidence in the legal sense, but it is a dataset that reveals patterns institutions consistently miss. Survivors often

describe how interviews focused on specific incidents rather than the overarching structure of harm. Many report that they shared extensive information, yet few questions were asked that could uncover the systemic nature of the abuse. As a result, essential components of the pattern remained invisible. The erosion of trust is a predictable outcome. When survivors realise that multiple actors, not only the perpetrator, hold power over their safety, and that institutions are not equipped to recognise the architecture of harm, trust in systems collapses. This collapse is not irrational; it is a rational response to systemic failure. Recognising lived experience as a form of structural insight, a lens through which patterns become visible, is essential for understanding coercive control. Without this lens, institutions will continue to misinterpret complex harm as isolated conflict.

9. The Manifest of Peace: A New Framework for Understanding Subjugation

Emerging frameworks such as the Manifest of Peace ([Manifestofpeace.org](https://manifestofpeace.org)) a new way to

understand coercive control as a global human rights issue. Rather than focusing solely on interpersonal dynamics, the Manifest situates subjugation within broader social, cultural, economic and institutional structures. It integrates lived experience with scientific research, highlighting how multiple forms of subjugation, psychological, technological, toxicological, sexual, financial, force (both mentally and physically), medical manipulation, cybercrime are cultural and structural, and interact to create an architecture of harm. The Manifest of Peace does not claim that all forms of coercive control are identical. Instead, it provides a multidimensional map that reveals how different mechanisms of subjugation reinforce one another. It shows how digital surveillance can amplify psychological erosion, how financial dependency can intensify social isolation, and how institutional blind spots can enable structural subjugation.

By framing coercive control as a systemic issue rather than a private conflict, the Manifest aligns with global human rights frameworks that recognise autonomy as a fundamental right. It calls for a shift in how societies understand harm: from

incident-based responses to structural analysis, from individual blame to systemic accountability, and from fragmented interventions to integrated protection. This framework is not merely theoretical. It is grounded in years of lived experience, research and international observation. It offers a path forward for institutions that have long struggled to recognise the architecture of coercive control, and for survivors who have been navigating that architecture without support.

10. What Needs to Change: A Structural Response to a Structural Problem

If coercive control is a structural problem, the response must be structural too. Incremental reforms, new risk assessments, isolated training modules, or incident-based interventions, will not dismantle an architecture of harm that spans psychological, digital, economic and institutional domains.

What is needed is a fundamental redesign of how societies understand and respond to subjugation.

First, institutions must shift from incident-based assessment to pattern-based analysis. Police, courts, child protection agencies and social services require frameworks that recognise coercive control as a multidimensional system rather than a series of isolated events. This includes training on digital surveillance, toxicological influence, financial restriction and structural subjugation, domains that are currently overlooked.

Second, interviews and investigations must be redesigned to uncover the architecture of harm, not merely its symptoms. Survivors consistently report that they were asked to recount specific incidents rather than describe the overarching pattern that governed their lives. Professionals need tools that allow them to map coercive control across time, domains and institutions.

Third, institutions must integrate lived experience as structural insight. Survivors are not passive recipients of harm; they are analysts of systems that failed them. Their accounts reveal patterns that data alone cannot capture. Recognising lived

experience as a form of expertise, not anecdote, is essential for building effective interventions.

Fourth, governments must invest in multidisciplinary protection systems that bridge the gaps between policing, social care, digital safety, financial regulation and public health. Coercive control thrives in fragmentation. Protection requires integration. Finally, societies must recognise coercive control as a human rights issue, not a private conflict. Autonomy is a fundamental right. Subjugation is a structural violation of that right. Addressing it requires political will, institutional reform and cultural change.

11. A Global Call to Action

Coercive control is not an inevitable feature of human relationships. It is a product of systems that fail to recognise the architecture of harm. When institutions overlook patterns, perpetrators exploit the gaps. When societies minimise psychological, digital or financial subjugation, victims are left without protection. When lived experience is dismissed, essential knowledge is lost.

But the architecture of harm is not invisible. Survivors have been mapping it for years. Researchers are beginning to understand its multidimensional nature. Emerging frameworks, including the Manifest of Peace, offer new ways to recognise and dismantle subjugation across familial, cultural and structural worldwide domains. The challenge now is global. Countries must redesign their protection systems to recognise patterns rather than incidents. Institutions must integrate lived experience as structural insight. Courts must expand their understanding of harm beyond physical injury. Child protection agencies must recognise coercive control as a threat to children's autonomy. Digital safety must become a core component of domestic abuse prevention. Economic autonomy must be treated as a protective factor. Coercive control is a human rights failure, but it is a failure we can address. By listening to survivors, integrating science with lived experience, and redesigning systems that were never built to recognise subjugation, societies can dismantle the architecture of harm. The

question is not whether coercive control can be recognised.

It is whether institutions are willing to see it.

And whether the world is ready to act.

12. Coercive Control and Undermining Criminality:

The Structural Connection Recent Dutch findings further illustrate that coercive control is not only a relational harm but also a structural driver of undermining criminality. The SKC-OC investigation, commissioned by the Ministry of Justice and Security and reported by NOS, showed how organised criminal networks increasingly infiltrate legitimate sectors such as Healthcare, Real Estate, Hospitality, Transport and Retail, creating what researchers describe as a “state within a state”. These dynamics mirror the same systemic vulnerabilities that enable coercive control: dependency, information asymmetry, intimidation, isolation, digital manipulation and institutional blind spots.

Our international network has identified seven additional sectors where similar patterns appear globally:

Sport & Leisure, Child Recreation, Telecom (telephone and hosting providers), Financial Services, Legal Services, Journalism and Politics. These domains share structural weaknesses that allow coercive control and organised exploitation to reinforce one another.

As noted in our commentary on   work (De prijs van het vuur), coercive control becomes visible only when patterns, context and power dynamics are recognised. Her analysis of technological control aligns with survivor testimony worldwide: coercive control is not a single behaviour but an architecture of harm spanning psychological, digital, economic and cultural domains.

One structural connection deserves explicit recognition:

Coercive control is not only a relational phenomenon, it is a motor behind domestic terror and organised criminal exploitation.

This becomes particularly clear in cases where perpetrators marry for financial or strategic

motives. Once the “loot” is secured, coercive control often escalates immediately, a pattern widely recognised in survivor accounts and frequently transmitted within criminal networks.

Journalist Saskia Belleman (De Telegraaf) highlighted a related concern in the podcast *Zij is van Mij* (She is Mine): misogynistic chants among students raise alarms because these individuals are the future doctors, lawyers and judges, or, as she noted, perhaps they already are. This underscores how cultural attitudes, institutional power and coercive control intersect.

Internationally, ^{5.1.2.e} [REDACTED]'s work (Click Stalk Destroy) confirms that organised criminality shares deep structural parallels with coercive control, stalking, digital abuse and violence behind the front door. Her research demonstrates that coercive control is not an isolated domestic issue but part of a global continuum of exploitation, enabled by digital tools, institutional gaps and cultural blind spots.

Recognising these connections is essential.

Coercive control and undermining criminality are interdependent phenomena. Addressing them requires collective awareness, integrated protection systems and a recognition that coercive control is both a human rights violation and a structural threat to democratic institutions.

This is why the Manifest of Peace, which we symbolically and officially handed over to the standing committees of five ministries of the Dutch Government on June 16th and July 15th, 2026, following our first petition against violence submitted to the Dutch Parliamentary Standing Committee for the Ministry of Justice and Security on January 20th, 2026, and this accompanying document, are designed as living frameworks.

These submissions reflect a growing international recognition that coercive control is not an interpersonal issue but a structural human rights failure. The frameworks evolve as survivors, researchers and institutions contribute new insights. Coercive control is not static; our understanding of it cannot be static either.

In a time of unprecedented human trafficking and child trafficking, acknowledging these structural links is not optional, it is necessary.