

Dr Stuart Waiton, Abertay University, s.waiton@abertay.ac.uk,

I would be available for an oral submission. I would also like to submit my Sage Open paper, *Third Way Parenting and the Creation of the "Named Person" in Scotland: The End of Family Privacy and Autonomy?* <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/2158244016629525>

I would like to draw attention to the change of approach from one focused on the 'welfare' of the child, to one focused on 'wellbeing' – something that has not been open and publically discussed. This is an approach that means that professional intervention is no longer based on the idea of 'significant risk of harm' to a child, but has become a far more all-encompassing idea of intervening based on 'concerns about wellbeing'. There appears to be a growing political consensus that professional 'support' for parents and children is unproblematic and good, and a diminishing recognition of the importance of privacy and autonomy for families. On top of this there is a problematic and often uncritical consensus about 'early intervention', despite the fact that this type of interventionism necessitates guess work and presumptions about future problems – problems that will very often not materialise. Essentially, what we are witnessing is a turnaround from a presumption that families are positive places that should be left to their own devices as much as possible to one where professional intervention is seen as a general good, perhaps even a necessity, for all families: better safe than sorry. This is an approach that completely underestimates the problems that intervening in families can create both at the level of individual families and perhaps more importantly, at a wider cultural level.

I would like to further draw attention to the extremely problematic concept of 'wellbeing'. This is an ill-defined concept that, when used in the context of potential state intervention, has dangerous implications for basic liberal principles. When used in its therapeutic form, wellbeing relates to the emotions of children and to their happiness. To be concerned about a child's happiness appears to be unproblematic and indeed to be a good thing. But when used through the Named Person and when professionals, through GIRFEC, come to see their role as monitors of children and parents' wellbeing and happiness, we create a remarkably subjective framework for intervention. More than this, we transform professionals and shift them, increasingly, away from their specific professional role, towards what has historically been recognised as a parental role. Professionals, whether teachers, health visitors or doctors should also be human beings – all rounded individuals. However, they should also recognise that they have a specific role, a job - teachers should teach and doctors should heal. Today, they are increasingly being trained (if we can call it training, considering it takes around a decade to train as a doctor and perhaps a couple of hours to be 'trained' about GIRFEC and the Named Person) to be safeguarders and wellbeing monitors of *all* children, and they risk becoming people who parents stop trusting or even confiding in because of this new more potentially intrusive role. Politicians need to be more honest about this aspect of the Named Person – it is not just a 'service that parents have asked for' – it is a new and more all-encompassing basis for state intervention into the family.

There are many problematic aspects to the Named Person, some are covered in the paper mentioned above. Perhaps the most problematic aspect of it is this idea of becoming wellbeing or happiness monitors. I am currently writing a paper on this and would happily give an oral submission on this topic later in the year.

Stuart Waiton