

New Hampshire, Deceptive Friendship, Coercion, and Repeated Physical Abuse of a Child

Union of Saints

“The conduct can be understood as a form of psychological manipulation and social engineering involving deception, coercion, isolation, and physical violence. If carried out as part of an organized campaign intended to intimidate or destabilize a population, similar methods can also appear within psychological or unconventional warfare.”

A Statement on Betrayal, Manipulation, and Violence

The Union of Saints recognizes that abuse does not always begin with an obvious threat. In some circumstances, an individual may present themselves as a friend, establish trust, and use that relationship to place another person in a vulnerable position. When the person being targeted is a child, the exploitation of trust can be particularly serious because children may reasonably rely upon friendship, familiarity, and the expectation that another person will not intentionally harm them.

One example of this pattern is when a person presents themselves as a friend to a child, encourages or pressures the child to leave a safe location, and then uses that opportunity to isolate and physically attack the child. If the person continues to describe themselves as a friend while repeatedly harming the child, the conduct involves both physical violence and a profound betrayal of trust.

A statement such as, “I am sorry, I did not mean to hurt you,” does not by itself establish that the first act was accidental. If the individual then intentionally harms the child again, the subsequent conduct must be considered separately. Repeated violence following an apology can create confusion for a child because the perpetrator is presenting themselves as a friend while engaging in conduct that is fundamentally inconsistent with friendship and safety.

Forms of Abuse That May Be Present

Depending upon the circumstances and evidence, conduct of this nature may involve several forms of abuse or misconduct.

Physical abuse or assault may be present when a child is intentionally struck, injured, or subjected to repeated physical violence.

Deception and manipulation may be present when a person deliberately presents a false image of friendship or safety in order to gain access to the child or influence the child's actions.

Coercive behavior may be present when a child is pressured, intimidated, manipulated, or otherwise induced to leave a safe environment against their better judgment.

Emotional or psychological abuse may occur when violence is combined with manipulation, intimidation, contradictory messages, humiliation, threats, or repeated attempts to make the child question what happened.

Betrayal-based abuse describes the additional harm that can occur when a person who has been trusted as a friend uses that trust to facilitate harm. For a child, the experience can affect their ability to determine whom they can safely trust.

Grooming-like conduct may be an appropriate description in circumstances where a person intentionally develops or performs a relationship of trust with a child for the purpose of gaining access, control, or an opportunity to cause harm. The term should be used carefully and should not automatically imply sexual conduct.

The Importance of the Child's Age

A child who is in their developing years occupies a fundamentally different position from an adult. Children may have less experience recognizing manipulation, may place greater reliance upon friendships, and may not immediately understand that apparently friendly behavior is being used to place them in danger.

A child should never be blamed for believing that someone who presents themselves as a friend is actually a friend. Trusting another person does not constitute permission to be harmed.

When an adult or another young person intentionally exploits a child's trust to facilitate violence, responsibility for that conduct belongs with the person who chose to engage in the harmful behavior.

Distinguishing Friendship From Abuse

Friendship requires a basic expectation of safety, respect, and good faith. A person cannot make repeated violence acceptable simply by continuing to call themselves a friend or by apologizing after an attack.

An apology can be meaningful when it is accompanied by genuine accountability and an immediate cessation of harmful behavior. When violence continues after an apology, the apology may become part of a confusing pattern in which the victim is encouraged to believe that the perpetrator is still a friend despite continuing harmful conduct.

The Union of Saints therefore encourages people to examine **patterns of conduct rather than labels**. Someone calling themselves a friend does not make their conduct friendly. A person's actions, particularly repeated actions, are more important than the title they give themselves.

Protecting Children and Preserving Their Safety

Children who experience this type of conduct deserve to be believed, protected, and treated with dignity. They should not be blamed for accepting an invitation, trusting another child or person, or failing to recognize that an apparently friendly interaction could become dangerous.

When allegations of childhood violence are discussed, the Union of Saints supports careful documentation of what was actually observed or experienced. Dates, locations, witnesses, injuries, communications, and other available evidence should be preserved whenever appropriate.

At the same time, conclusions about a person's motives should be distinguished from established facts. It is possible to clearly identify violence, deception, coercion, and betrayal of trust without making unsupported allegations about why the perpetrator acted as they did.

A Principle of the Union of Saints

The Union of Saints believes that **trust should never be weaponized against a child**.

A child should be able to accept friendship without being unknowingly led into danger. A person who uses the appearance of friendship to obtain access to a child and then repeatedly harms that child has violated the basic principles of trust, safety, respect, and human dignity.

The appropriate response to such circumstances is not to blame the child for trusting someone. The appropriate response is to protect the child, document the conduct honestly, seek appropriate assistance, and ensure that the child's experience is taken seriously.

Investigation

Who?

What?

When?

Where?

Why?

How?

Questions

What political factors are there?

What actions and behaviors led to this event?

Where were the parents of the assailant?

Was this behavior normalized?

Were the individuals outsiders or newcomers of the group?

Were they acquaintances or friends?

Strategic Warfare

More Specifically

Psychological warfare (PSYWAR): Attempts to influence or destabilize a person's psychological state rather than relying solely on physical force.

Social engineering: Manipulating a person's trust and behavior to get them to do something they otherwise might not do. This term is widely used in intelligence and cybersecurity, but the underlying concept can apply more broadly.

Deception operations (MILDEC): Deliberately creating a false perception or expectation in order to influence someone's behavior.

Coercive control: Using manipulation, intimidation, or violence to control another person's behavior. This is more of an abuse framework than a formal military operation.

Irregular or unconventional warfare: A much broader category involving methods that operate outside conventional battlefield combat.

Metropolitan Spillover and Suburbanization From Massachusetts Into New Hampshire

Expressions

Changes in historical community character

Ghettoization

Drug wars, crimefare, streetfare

Housing pressure, homeless encampment developments

Pollution

Normalization of violence, assault, victimization of local residents

Political changes

Implications of urbanization or Massachusetts city assimilation into New Hampshire communities

Migration Into New Hampshire

44% of migrants to New Hampshire came from Massachusetts.

About **six in ten New Hampshire residents in 2024 were born outside New Hampshire**, and the state also receives migrants from other states and internationally.

60% of New Hampshire residents are no longer native New Hampshire residents.

6.8% were born outside the United States.

The Picture Is Essentially

Massachusetts → New Hampshire

Maine and Vermont → New Hampshire

Florida → New Hampshire

New York and Connecticut → New Hampshire

Pennsylvania → New Hampshire

Other U.S. states → New Hampshire

International migration → New Hampshire