

**Killers are Made, Not Born**

**by Faye Snyder, PsyD**

# **Killers are Made, Not Born**

by Faye Snyder, PsyD

## **The Premise:**

Killers are getting younger, and the violence will not end until we allow ourselves the forbidden insight: killers are made, not born.

It is my observation that genetics are irrelevant in the formation of personality, especially severe pathology. I draw this conclusion after having facilitated hundreds of interventions in the lives of young children which changed their personalities significantly from the realm of avoidant, inauthentic, reactive, rebellious, bossy, violent, deceptive, shy, arrogant, controlling, and defensive, etc. to honest, authentic, natural, expressive, spontaneous, and so forth. I believe that evidence demonstrates that genes provide the design of the body and the method by which experience is recorded. Unique experience then impacts the body-with-brain, to include a person's world view, self-view, and coping mechanisms in such a way as to form what we call personality. Nevertheless, most of society is still attached to the notion that genetics plays a significant role in the formation of personality. Hence "the bad seed theory." In order to proceed with this essay and for argument's sake, I willingly grant the possibility that genetics plays a role, and I am still able to make the point that the role of genetics is irrelevant.

This essay considers the parental causes behind violence. It can be shown even in studies purported to demonstrate the impact of genetics on behavior that any such predisposition can be mitigated by bad or good parenting. In identical twin studies, it is obvious that no two twins turn out alike. They only have some things in common, which could be attributed to either genetics

or environment. Twins have many more differences than similarities. Further, there are recent works challenging the research structure and conclusions of twin studies for built in bias. (Ty Colbert, Bruce Perry)

Genetics is something, which even if it has a role, cannot be corrected. Genetics, as cause for behavior, is a theoretical way of abandoning responsibility for all the myriad of opportunities parents have to make a difference along the course of a childhood. There is nothing we can do about genetics. We can do everything about parenting, if we are so inspired. Children's home environments can be helped. Any genetic predisposition could be corrected with good parenting. Those who advocate genetics as cause or parental excuse seem to be motivated to protect parents from responsibility for how their children suffer or turn out.

As nature loves a paradox, this point is not intended to facilitate abdication of responsibility for choices made by grown children of bad parenting any more than this article seeks to absolve "bad" parents for the long-term effects their choices have on their grown children.

It is my intention here to demonstrate how we can account for behavioral pathology by virtue of unhealthy childhoods. My essay and my work is based upon my theory, The Causal Theory, which conversely informs parents how to raise their children for greatness.

Assessing and treating children and grown children of childhood trauma is my life, my passion, and my profession, and, as such, prevention is my goal. I have been teaching a state-of-the-art parenting class, *The Miracle Child Parenting Series*, since 1988, on how to raise a low-maintenance, high functioning, charming and ethical child. The same course teaches parents how to create personality disorders and other disorders, as well, in hopes that by so doing, parents will

self-consciously steer clear of harmful actions. Students are taught cause and effect very carefully, and they are warned that there is no diagnosis unless they have a match between cause and effect. Otherwise, diagnosis is pointless labeling. I also teach parents how to repair damage done, because I want parents to be experts on healing for their own sake, as well as their children's. I interviewed Richard Ramirez, *The Night Stalker*, extensively. I studied the transcripts of Jeffrey Dahmer's evaluators and spoke extensively with biographer Joel Norris. I followed the trial of the Menendez Brothers from gavel to gavel. I have followed the cases of many other killers any way I could, and kept my ears glued to Court TV, because making sense of people's behavior is my moment to moment preoccupation. This book is my attempt to share with you how behavior makes sense to me. I have an extensive practice which includes healing grown children and children of every degree of abuse and neglect. Cause and effect applies to people too. Hence, the Causal Theory.

Violence is not only a product of abuse, it's also a product of parental neglect in a multitude of almost invisible forms. When *both* parents work *and* the parental neglect of children grows in magnitude, we can expect to see more and more violence. Neglect is not just a function of a lack of supervision. Neglect is a lack of daily intimacy. Children need the experience in the first few years of being touched, seen, and known by the same person with whom they interact regularly. Nannies and childcare does not a healthy childhood make. Rotating caregivers does not a healthy adulthood make. The more the childcare providers change, the more long-term injuries are sustained by the child.

Since it is part of our design as well as our cultural ethic to honor parents *no matter what*, even psychologists can be reluctant to recognize what is right under our noses. Honoring parents

can include honoring what they want.

## **Untold Tragedy:**

When the McMartin's were found not-guilty on January 8, 1990 of numerous counts of child molestation at their Manhattan, California preschool, the field of psychology was forever changed. Psychological theory, especially forensic psychology, was probably set back as severely as it was when Freud recanted his seduction theory that histrionic symptoms come from incest. He substituted this insight with a more acceptable theory that histrionic symptoms were the result of imagined abuse and inborn drives.

The children' stories were too preposterous to believe, the jury concluded, especially since some children reported having been taken underground to cemeteries where they were forced to pummel dead bodies, watch them burn, lie in caskets, and witness satanic weddings. Even the prosecutors had conceded that the outlandish reports discredited the children. Some children led parents and prosecutors to a nearby cemetery and crematorium, the interior details of which the children had already accurately described, and where they said many of these events had taken place. But the district attorney's office was resentful and distrustful of such extreme allegations and declined to dig for tunnels. March 16, 1985 a small group of assertive parents commissioned a backhoe to dig for the tunnels in the lot next to the campus, where the children described the burial of sacrificial animals. The district attorney's office then commissioned a limited archeological survey of the site. The net effect of that effort was to disclaim any unusual underground activity. It was simply too much to believe, and the memories of children have become suspect ever since. Some researchers have become famous for their supporting studies of the unreliability of children's memories or anyone's memory for that matter. These experts

are now highly paid popular experts for the defense in cases where children make allegations of abuse against adults, especially parents.

To make matters worse, the interviewing technique used by Kee MacFarlane from Children's Institute International, was discredited, since she sometimes asked leading questions. The techniques of therapists, as well, have become suspect ever since, including any complicity on the part of therapists who would be willing to believe and thus support their patient's outrageous recovered memories of sexual abuse by a parental figure, especially if these memories were recovered only after starting therapy. Nevertheless, our field now knows how to interview children safely for court purposes by asking open ended questions which leave out the answer in the question.

Since that verdict, a whole crop of behavioral scientists began publishing research discrediting children's memories and their therapists, asserting a theory of False Memory Syndrome. These scientists hold that forgotten and later recalled memories of sexual abuse cannot take place. We either remember or we don't, they say, and if one has such a recollection during therapy, it is because a well-meaning zealot of a therapists had the power to plant a suggestion in their patient's mind that they were molested by their parents, when, in fact they were not.

One of the leading researchers, Elizabeth Loftus, frequently cited or called upon by defense attorneys to testify in court as an expert to the unreliability of memory, admits herself, that she remembers being molested, but can't say who it was. I confess I wonder if one remembers the violation, but not the perpetrator, whether the possibility exists that the betrayal was more traumatic than the violation, itself. The repressed memory may be the aspect of the

memory that was the most forbidden or the most unbearable. In other words, it can be more unbearable to remember *who* abused us than to remember the abuse itself. When people repress trauma from childhood, they commonly act it out in adulthood, even in the form of a profession. It would make sense, analytically, if someone became a scientist to enforce, "If I don't get to remember who abused me, you don't get to remember who abused you either."

Since the McMartin verdict there has become a war of the researchers. Some seek vehemently and flagrantly to prove the capacity of therapists to induce false memories, and even dare to advise clinicians how to talk to their clients when they, themselves, have minimal experience, if any, as a clinician. Other researchers, usually clinicians, as well, seek to prove that memories can be recalled accurately enough under protected circumstances. In the meantime, a multitude of clinicians who have learned to be careful in their speculations, continue to experience clients recovering memories. One could see how patients having true recollections are re-injured, when their memories are discredited by other therapists and a host of purveyors of the false memory theory.

Speculation and innuendo, such as that which I just risked, is not only rude, potentially libelous, and a violation of conventional taboos which protect parents or loved ones, but it shackles forensic psychology. It is considered dangerous and unprofessional to speculate on motives when that motive implies childhood trauma. Thus, forensic psychology keeps its speculations around the immediate motives behind drives themselves, not their origins. That is, forensic psychologists often focus on the thinking of the criminal, not how he got that way. As a matter of fact, they commonly maintain that while they can expose patterns of behavior, drives, and thought, no one knows how criminals or killers become the way they are. To reiterate, most

leading specialists in the field of forensic psychology actually hold that causes for criminal behavior are not known! The material I am about to cover dares to do show that it is known and knowable, however insurgent. Further, the cost to our children and our society for not being willing to know is the greatest tragedy of the McMartin Trial. Before I continue, there is something I would like you to know.

*The False Memory scientists have made it a taboo to speculate on the possible causes behind a person's acting out, especially if it implicates a parent.* This fallout results in large part because no tunnels were found and the verdict was not guilty. But there were tunnels. Four months after the verdict and the property was sold, the new owner gave permission to dig *under* the school site, and an archeologist, E. Gary Stickel, Ph.D., was hired from the University of California at Los Angeles. (Rolland Summit, The Dark Tunnels of McMartin, *The Journal of Psychohistory* 21 (4) Spring, 1994. p 397-416) The parents had dissolved their affiliation in the aftermath of the verdict and only one parent, a single mom, shouldered the expense of the excavation and the report. One child, Joanie, age 12 in the year 1994, agreed to revisit the school and guide the archeologists. She gave a Ameticulous description of every step along the way. Starting from the parents' dig in the northeast corner of the classroom #3, she described being lifted down a hole, turning right, going straight past the roots that brushed your face, turning right again where you were hurried through the long tunnel. I liked to stop where the pipe was and swing on it. There was a little boy who couldn't reach the pipe, and sometimes I'd lift him up so he could touch it. But right after that you had to duck down so you wouldn't hit your head on the cement, then you had to run again to get to the secret room.'

As archeologists followed Joanie's directions they unearthed a trail of contrasting soil

where the tunnels had apparently been filled in. An avocado tree's roots preceded a cast iron waste pipe which was followed by a deep concrete foundation and all the other details Joanie predicted. Beneath the floor of the exit, inside the vertical plane of the foundation, in fill undisturbed by the earlier excavations, a plastic lunch bag was found bearing the date of its distribution: >DISNEY CLASS 82/83' also printed >[copyright] 1982 Walt Disney Productions.' Except for some kind of clandestine intrusion, nothing in the location could have been newer than September, 1966, when the foundation was poured. (Summit, 1994)

Sometimes truth doesn't seem to prevail.

### **Something's Missing:**

I crossed paths with the late Dr. Joel Norris, biographer of numerous serial killers in 1990. I had just left a visit with Richard Ramirez, the convicted Night Stalker who invaded the homes of numerous people leaving 13 people dead. Joel and I both wanted to write Richard's biography. Philip Carlo won the bid and published *The Night Stalker*. Richard was adamant that he didn't want any biographer to discuss his childhood in depth. Carlo was apparently good with that and preoccupied himself with the crimes instead. The first thing I theorized from interviewing Richard Ramirez, which has since panned out, was that killers hide, not unlike forensic psychologists, cover and deny parental abuse and neglect more than anyone. No one Honors Thy Father and Thy Mother like a serial killer, I surmised. They repress more than the rest of us, harder than the rest of us ever would. If they didn't, they wouldn't be killers. Scapegoating can't happen, if one doesn't repress the truth of their trauma. (Alice Miller, *For*

*Your Own Good, Thou Shalt Not Be Aware)*

Joel and I became fast friends, but we argued. Joel was certain that serial killers had brain damage, chemical imbalances and neurological impairments which could be proven by tests and to a great degree had been. Thinking that he meant genetics, I disagreed adamantly. I believed that was another ruse for the bad seed theory. I was certain that the primary cause of serial and other killers was traumatic childhoods. Neither of us could help but contribute to the other's argument. In facing Richard, I had inquired about numerous major scars around his head and face. I'm certain Richard lied to me about from whence they came. The explanation I remember the most was, "I fell off a train. Even if he had such an accident, why was he so accident prone?"

Now, I wish I could tell Joel that we were both right. Though not a researcher, *per se*, Dorothy Otnow Lewis, M.D., has probably come closer than anyone to demonstrating this. To their great surprise, Lewis and her reluctant colleague, Jonathan Pincus, M.D., behavioral neurologist, determined in a series of evaluations of violent criminals that possibly all of those they assessed had neurologic damage from head trauma. (Pincus prefers "neurologic" over "neurological") Lewis reports in her book, *Guilty by Reason of Insanity*, that the cause of the neurologic damage was severe abuse, however, she frequently states that neurologic damage by itself would not necessarily a killer make. Throughout her book she had to be an investigator to get to the abuse, because the killers usually didn't Atell on their parents, sometimes simply because they couldn't remember. One man scheduled to be executed didn't even know that he had horrendous scars on his back. Lewis discovered this by interviewing his brothers before the execution. *Then* she examined the condemned for verification. Further, the crimes mimic the

abuse, just as Alice Miller, M.D., researched, observed, and theorized in her book, *For Your Own Good*. Sometimes people don't tell, because they can't bear to remember their abuse. They believe it was just too painful to remember. Sometimes they can't bear to acknowledge their betrayal, because they believe it's too painful to acknowledge the betrayal. Sometimes, they are forbidden to speak or to know they were betrayed, because they have to protect their parent's identity at all cost. So, when we cannot acknowledge what has happened to us, we act it out. "What goes in must come out," is my own observation of behavior. When we can't tell our story or it is forbidden to be told, we reenact it. When our story is unconscious, we represent it anyway. What we imprint, we repeat. People reveal how they were treated by how they act. Serial killers reenact most dramatically their childhood traumas. People who don't get this may think people act the way they do, because it's genetic. They may notice that people's parents act similarly to their children, surmising that it *must* be genetic. To assume that behavior is genetic, when we have been treated the same way is just plain silly. All religions understand The Golden Rule because they understand that people are driven to treat one another the way they have been treated.

Once when Joel and I were actually agreeing, he asked me if I'd ever heard of Avampires. He told me to pick up *Bloodlust* by Carol Page. Joel was writing the biography, *Jeffrey Dahmer*, who killed seventeen young men, trying to keep them close. Joel asked me to listen to his recordings of expert testimony at Dahmer's sentencing hearing from the Court TV Channel, including Dr. Parker Dietz, although Dr. Judith Becker was the only one who got to interview Dahmer, and the rest made their evaluations based on Dr. Becker's report. I listened to all of these forensic experts for Joel, and my observations were to go into his book, but the book was

rushed to deadline before my additions were included. So, I inadvertently saved my assessments for my own work, here.

One major observation I made was that all of the psychologists and psychiatrists were behavioral theorists. None were able to glean from Dahmer's childhood the import of the things Dahmer revealed, in spite of himself. Dahmer, just like Ramirez, was protective of his parents. If I were the concerned parent of a serial killer who was dutifully in charge of hiring court evaluators, I, too, would pick only behavioral psychologists. For sure, I could count on behavioral psychologists to not look for abandonment, neglect, repression or abuse as causes behind the crimes. It's against their beliefs and training. Motives, drives and their origins are not knowable, behaviorists believe.

Joel wanted to know if I knew of a term which represented a kind of neglect which would leave a person hungry, no *starving* for skin contact, even for *flesh and blood*. I responded with the standard terminology, *severe neglect*, and he gave me a scornful look, as if to say, *That much, I know*. *Severe neglect* conjures up images of barely any food, a filthy house and dirty kids left alone during the days and even some nights, but it doesn't bring to mind a lack of holding and touching babies. Joel wanted a term which pointed to the kind of neglect which leaves babies in cribs with often unchanged diapers and curdled milk for days, weeks and months, unattended, unloved, unheld, and untouched. We sorted numerous words and their ramifications until we hit upon *morbid neglect*. We liked it because it implied unwholesomeness, disease, gloom, and even potential death. It pointed to death as a prognosis, that is, *somebody's* death. It was a serious word, more serious than *severe*. Joel liked it. *We* like it. I'm not sure if Joel ever used the term. As time has gone by, I have had a heightened

awareness to morbid neglect, and I've made ongoing note of it's effects. Hence, I introduce a term that I have never seen used in the literature, but for good cause, and in memory of Joel and his tender insight.

There were some important parenting lessons in the case of Jeffrey Dahmer: (1) Babies need to be held and touched extensively. (2) They need to bond and attach to a certain someone with trust and maintain that relationship continuously. (3) They need to express their feelings to someone who cares. (4) They need empathy. Without these things, they cannot become truly human. Jeffrey Dahmer did not have these experiences enough to become psychologically human.

I learned from Joel, as well as the tapes, that Dahmer's father, Lionel, was a student and then chemist who worked long hours. I learned that Lionel's wife, Jeffrey's mother, was reportedly bipolar and took large amounts of drugs during her pregnancy with Jeffrey and during his early childhood. Jeffrey recalled that his parents didn't get along. They fought. That is, his mother raged at his father often, and Jeffrey's father, the relatively warmer parent, endeavored to avoid her as much as he could by working long hours. Jeffrey recalled one time fleeing the house and hugging a tree outside while listening to the sounds of his mother screaming at his father. It sounded to me as if she might be more the raging Borderline Personality type than (manic-depressive) bipolar, and that he was more prone toward logical, passive or even avoidant responses which may have tended to inflame the situation, rather than resolve it. Jeffrey had little memory of any interaction with his mother at all.

Jeffrey recalled spending a lot of time alone. As evidence that he was completely unattached and neglected, as well, he remembered wandering down the road at about three years

of age. I say this, because a three-year-old would not wonder away, unless they were unattached. A person would not report such a memory, unless they were unattached. He recalled having been startled as he opened the door of an abandoned old barn as a multitude of rats scurried past him.

There was another frightening time, at about age four when Jeffrey had a hernia operation. He entered surgery alone. He exited surgery alone. He remained in the hospital for an extended time without visitors believing that he had been taken into surgery to have his genitals removed. Unless one were a strict Freudian theorist, we would have to wonder from where such a belief came. Once, when my son visited his god parents, they had a visitor who told him, if he wasn't good, someone (I can't remember who) would cut off his penis. My son returned home very alarmed and distraught over this misinformation, something he had never considered before and something we quickly consoled away.

One would have surmised different things about Jeffrey's childhood from a June 17, 2004 interview with his "parents," though his mother is deceased, his father was seldom home, and his step-mother came on board at 18. Lionel Dahmer told Larry King that he did not understand why Jeff turned out the way he did. He says he Believes in Absolute Truth, a religious concept, I believe, and while he felt no guilt for Jeff's actions, since he wasn't a participant, he should have been less involved in the marriage and more involved with the child so he could have recognized any clues (to inborn pathology?) more quickly. He also said that Jeff had a double hernia which somehow gave him the impression that he had been castrated.

It struck me that Lionel and his wife have been quite courageous in their own way. They have their own form of dignity. Yet, I had to remind myself that there had been a lack of authenticity in Jeffrey's childhood. Jeffrey had not been seen. He was alone, deeply alone. His

father still does not see that. You can even see how a belief in Otherly Cause (genetics or otherwise) in behavior can leave a parent lacking curiosity when the clues are in front of them. Lionel said he had wished to have Jeffrey's brain scanned while he was alive to see if anything could have been learned. He earnestly sought to understand, except how Jeffrey was treated.

Dahmer told Dr. Becker that he only recalled three intimate moments with his parents. Amongst his three warm moments, he remembered his mother teaching him to impale butterflies for mounting. He recalled his father teaching him to gut fish. In this instance, he recollected the innards of the fish glistening with life in the sunlight. He savored in his memory the special moment when his mother allowed him to put his hand and ear to her belly when she was pregnant with his little brother. All three memories relate to flesh and internal life and death. This was poignant to Jeffrey, given he had no other recollection of having been touched or held. His crimes point to a complete lack of touch. Even though Dahmer had to have repressed an enormous amount of rage for his neglect, the primary motive behind his crimes was not expressed violence, however much he lacked the capacity for empathy or conscience. Dahmer's expressed primary motives for killing were to keep his companions (who had skin) from ever leaving. He wanted to lay next to another human being, a male (like his father), skin to skin, forever. He obsessed over how he could keep them from leaving him, first trying drugs, then lobotomy, then murder. Even corpses weren't satisfying enough, because they deteriorated. He finally found ways to preserve them, internalize them, that is, eat symbolic pieces of them, and he could keep a part of them for an altar where he could preserve the memory he had of having been intimately close to them for a short while. These were his ways to keep them close, especially inside of him. He was literally starving for human touch and human flesh.

Jeffrey Dahmer was a Schizoid personality. That is, having never bonded with another human being, he had a mechanical approach to human interaction. He did not grasp empathy or bonding. He didn't know how to feel for another human being, because a person who has never been cared for or bonded to another human being, is incapable of caring for another person in a human, empathic way. He simply suffered a lack of touch and craved it, even though he had not learned how to relate socially and intimately.

Dahmer's favorite song was by The Who. It was the song we all remember from the 70's. The lyrics which he quoted were:

See me,

Feel me.

Touch me,

Heal me.

Jeffrey Dahmer had a dream he reported to Dr. Becker. She admitted that she didn't understand the dream nor give it meaning, behavioral psychologist that she was. In the dream Dahmer was in the lobby of a hotel where all the beautiful people lived. The floor of the lobby was filled with residents who were down on the floor pounding and raging, all wearing leather jackets. Only two people were standing: Jeffrey and an older man at quite a distance, who he tried to reach, but for some reason couldn't.

None of the forensic behavioral psychologists or psychiatrists who were included in the evaluation of her interview results interpreted the dream or the song. It seems apparent to me that Jeffrey was trying to get to his father, who was unreachable. It was Jeffrey's father, who offered a hope of warmth or empathy, if only he could be reached. If only he would have spent

some time at home. The beautiful people had their feelings and could let them out freely, especially their anger. Jeffrey must have been carrying intense anger from which he had split off, because he felt so neglected and deprived. He had also been exposed to ongoing hateful arguments between his parents, especially his mother's rage at his father. He had witnessed his father duck away repeatedly from her. Primarily, he was a person who had split off from his feelings, and his subconscious mind knew other people were allowed to have feelings. Even though Jeffrey was cut off from his feelings completely, his right brain was just as wise and magnificent as was the rest of ours. Jeffrey's right brain, the brain which dreamed, understood that both he and his father were cut off not only from one another, but each from their feelings.

In his dream the beautiful people wore leather jackets because they had skin or hides. The sense of having skin or a container or a physical sense of ourselves comes from having been touched in the first year of life. Beautiful people experience their skin (symbolized by the leather jackets), and beautiful people get their feelings. They are entitled to have their anger, even their rage.

Jeffrey lacked empathy for others, because he had not enjoyed it himself. What doesn't go in, can't come out. Conversely, what goes in must come out. Hence, drives. Human beings have different drives, one from another. All of us are driven, some to be productive, others to do nothing, some to destroy or molest, while still others are driven to achieve greatness or self-destruct. We are all driven to one degree or another, in different ways, because we are exposed to different treatment.

Jeffrey Dahmer wanted to share with Dr. Becker his favorite quote from the Bible:

For what I want to do, I don't do.

But what I hate, I do.

And if I do what I do not want to do,

I agree that the law is good. (Romans 7:15-16)

Dr. Dorothy Otnow Lewis contributes in *Guilty by Reason of Insanity* that violent people have suffered brain trauma, as well as abuse and neglect. Attachment theorists add that violent people lack attachment. Psychiatrist Elliott Barker is one of the leading international attachment theorists. He is associated with Ontario's maximum security mental hospital, the Canadian Society for the Prevention of Cruelty and the Empathic Parenting Quarterly. He has evaluated and testified regarding more than 200 cases of murder, rape and other crimes of violence. He claims that without exception all psychopaths have suffered a lack of attachment in the first year of life or attachment breaks caused by *extreme and multiple separations from care givers in the first three to five years of life*. As such, they lack the ability to trust and have little or no capacity for affection, empathy or conscience. Barker writes, "Individuals who commit crimes can do so in large part because they lack the capacity to be affected by how their victims feel. They know how they feel, but that knowledge does not affect them in the same way it affects normal people. The capacity to be affected by how others feel is developed in the earliest years – before the age of about three. What is more significant is that this capacity cannot be learned or taught or put into a person after that age with any in known method of treatment. This capacity to be affected by how others feel is developed most strongly when infants and toddlers are empathically cared for by the same few people all the time – people who are willing and able to meet the child's emotional needs." (website Elliott Barker, MD: The Social Causes of Crime – All children behave as well as they are treated.)

Since Jeffrey Dahmer suffered from morbid neglect, and he was a specimen of a completely unattached human being, it was not necessary for him to suffer external head trauma to become a danger to society. Hopefully, we can get past our disgust to learn the lesson which is in front of us.

To reiterate, (1) Jeffrey Dahmer suffered from a lack of touch. (2) He was unbonded and unattached. (3) He was totally unable to express his feelings, and (4) there was no one who had empathy for him or who cared to hear his feelings. If these things had been sufficiently different, he wouldn't have been a killer. He could have lived a fulfilling life, and Lionel Dahmer wouldn't have to look any further for the reasons why his son became a cannibal.

### **Where Violence Breeds:**

Unless we are talking about physical abuse so violent that it causes brain damage, THE WORST THING WHICH CAN HAPPEN TO A CHILD IS MORBID NEGLECT in the first year of life. Even if you change your child's diapers three times a day and leave fresh milk in the bottle every day, if you rarely talk to him, rarely hold, caress or touch your baby, you are committing morbid neglect. Babies and small children *require* touch, holding and cuddling to be human or humane. They must also be rocked. Lack of touch creates a lack of a physical sense of one's self, and in some cases, a form of sensory deprivation.

Such children grow up with a morbid depression, sometimes manifesting in suicide. For no apparent reason if not simply due to a chemical imbalance, caused by trauma. It is popularly assumed that trauma doesn't create chemical imbalance, especially when it's repressed,

but it does. As children and adults of morbid neglect, they tolerate pervasive and unbearable feelings of emptiness and worthlessness. They also feel invisible. They tend to isolate, because that's all they know. Their social skills may be dismal, because interaction with other humans is foreign to them. They have little or no experience communicating about their internal pain. The thought of complaining to someone rarely, if ever, crosses their mind. Yet they suffer a drive to do violence to and on behalf of the way they feel, to those who are not neglected, and perhaps to parent-figures, such as teachers, who also fail to see or value them. Additionally, a morbidly neglected child may not develop intellectually.

Sometimes, right before our eyes, neglect is taking place leaving long-term consequences.

ANOTHER BAD THING WHICH CAN HAPPEN TO A CHILD IS INVISIBLE NEGLECT.

Babies and small children *require* loving, continuous interaction for normal brain development. The invisibly neglected child may not develop emotionally. I have presumed to introduce another term here, *Invisible neglect*, to represent a type of neglect which I find most people are unable to perceive, thus, invisible. I presume they cannot see it, simply because they were not fully seen in their childhoods. The results of invisible neglect or *Lack of attunement* as attachment theorists call it, are often considered hereditary or genetic. Three psychiatrists came to explain it beautifully:

Genetic information lays down the brain's basic macro- and microanatomy; experience then narrows still expansive possibilities into an outcome. Out of many, several: out of several, one... While genes are pivotal in establishing some aspects of emotionality, experience plays a central role in turning genes on and off. DNA is not the heart's destiny; the genetic lottery may determine the cards in

your deck, but experience deals the hand you can play... Like most of their toys, children arrive with considerable assembly required... A child's brain cannot develop normally without the coordinating influence that limbic communication furnishes. The coos and bumbles that infants and parents exchange, the cuddling, rocking, and joyous peering into each other's faces look innocuous if not inane; one would not suspect a life-shaping process in the offing. But from their first encounter, parents guide the neurodevelopment of the baby they engage with. In his primal years, they mold a child's inherited emotional brain into the neural core of the self. (Lewis, T; Amini, F. & Lannon, R. (2002). *A General Theory of Love*. New York: Random House. pp. 149-153)

All of the Sch-diagnoses--Schizoid, Schizophrenia, and Schizotypal--have little or no sense of skin. They survive a touch deprivation in the first year of life. Since they are touch-deprived, they have a thin or almost non-existent sense of themselves, so they are weakly defended against events that happen to them after the first year of life. From the second year on the Schizoid is basically ignored; the Schizophrenic lives with a lot of strong projections and mixed messages; and the Schizotypal is treated as if spirits are real, and what is actually real is not real or really doesn't matter, thus becoming highly susceptible to voodoo or airy fairy beliefs. Many Schizotypal personalities become mystics or street people, having a poor sense of problem-solving or of the material world.

Lack of touch often results in skin issues, some apparent, and some invisible. Though formal research predominantly represents that schizophrenia is genetic, many researchers are beginning to question that proposition. More and more experts, who are both scientists *and*

clinicians, maintain that schizophrenia results from invisible forms of neglect, leaving the infant sensory deprived. As the child gets older, he enters into an environment of disingenuous communication patterns, to include projections onto him about his motives and thoughts. Without having been sufficiently touched and without having a strong enough sense of himself, he cannot defend against these projections. He cannot tell where he ends and his parent(s) begin. His thoughts are theirs, and theirs, his.

When a child lacks a *physical* sense of herself, she can also be at high risk for schizophrenia, especially if parents do a lot of pretending about their relationships, while ignoring real circumstances. Because she has a tenuous sense of herself, her Acontainer, her skin, she has no sense of where she ends and others begin. She may think others read her mind and she theirs. She feels unreal. Then, if her parents act inauthentically, her mental life may become more vivid than reality. Hugging in her family may be stilted, for example, and the AI love you's are said in a cold way. The child never *feels* loved, valuable, seen, or understood, so her conceptual wiring may be tenuous. Parents may put the child in a double-bind, a la Gregory Bateson in *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*, in which the child cannot win. For example, a mother may say, (1) AWe are honest in our family. (2) She may also punish the child for revealing to an outsider that dad is an alcoholic. So, if the child is asked, (3) AWhat do you think of your father?

The child may develop a safe Aword-salad that ADaddy is a good banana. Projections may be commonly made about people's motives in her family, especially hers. She, herself, may begin to read intentions louder than words. She may notice that seriously wild, strange, or dramatic things are going on in the family which nobody appears to notice. She may develop a fragile sense of what's true or real, and her vocabulary may be confusing to avoid the double-bind. She

may develop a fantasy world and vocabulary to match in order to keep herself company, for the lack of connection she feels. She may manage in a structured environment to evidence no signs of schizophrenia, but when she's on her own, and she's in charge of assessing and dealing with reality, her ethereal sense of herself may surface, especially as her ineffectual actions and choices fail to serve her.

That schizophrenia is the result of parenting is most evident by the studies that claim to prove schizophrenia is genetic. If it were genetic, all identical twins separated at birth would both develop schizophrenia, if one did. Identical twin studies of babies separated "at birth" do not unanimously report both children having schizophrenia in every case. As a matter of fact, it's not even remarkable. It's funny how this research has been skewed to make it look like these twin studies prove that schizophrenia is genetic. Research can be said to show that there is *some* correlation between identical twins separated at birth who develop schizophrenia separately as compared to a random sample of the population. That same research can show that in *most* of the cases of identical twins, where one sibling developed schizophrenia, the other did not. (Ty Colbert, 2001) Further, researchers have recently shown that the correlation between the identical twins may never have truly existed, as originally represented. (The twins weren't separated exactly at birth, and in some cases, were separated at one year; they were often given to close relatives who shared similar family dynamics; some twins were considered to have schizophrenia for having the slightest symptoms, or for Borderline or Bi-Polar symptoms; some were not properly evaluated by mental health experts, etc.) Nevertheless, I would say that the research proves that the majority of the twins did not have schizophrenia, though their sibling did, because they were parented well enough. If schizophrenia were truly genetic, then both

twins would have had schizophrenia, if one twin had it.

I am treating a schizophrenic client who was born to two parents who worked, so his grandmother cared for him during the days of his first year of his life. When he was two, his mother took over for awhile, creating an attachment break. But since parenting him tested her limits and she often blew up at her toddler, she put him in preschool and went back to work, re-injuring his attachment wound. When he was about three his parents got divorced, due to an affair no one acknowledge his mother had in the home with his father's lifetime best friend. The father took custody of the child, but had to continue working. He took the child with him, but always set him up so that the child would be out of reach while he labored. The child began to astral project or imagine himself closer to his father. The father married, and one day upon visiting his mother, the child referred to his step-mother as AMommy . The mother, screamed at her son, AShe is not your mother! I am your mother! After that, the child completely disengaged from his step-mother and began investing completely in his mother. She rarely came on time or when she said she would be there. He was often seen to be waiting by the window for her. To her credit, she began to realize that something was wrong with the child when he was in early elementary school. She asked the father to take him for therapy. The father took him, but the waiting room wait was too long for him to bear. He decided that there was nothing wrong with his son that his son wouldn't outgrow. Nevertheless, the child began to behave in more and more disorganized ways at school and at home with the step-mother. On the surface, it looked like a normal family, because they are all nice people, very nice people.

Morbid and invisible neglect may lead to the schizoid personality. It results from minimal social interaction at home and leads into a lack of sentimentality as an adult. Rather, the

adult has a mechanical approach to relationships, and can even find mannequins and blow-up dolls safer company than people. Schizoids often relate to machinery for their adult occupation, and they are preoccupied with skin. Some may join nudist colonies to see skin, including their own, or spend hours in nudie bars or at the beach, not for sexual pleasure, but to watch skin. A male schizoid child may grow up choosing to cross dress, usually in secret, even though he is heterosexual. Or he may keep a piece of women's satin clothing under his pillow or prefer to wear satin undies. He may have long fingernails, subconsciously pretending a woman's touch is near. A client of mine who spent money he couldn't afford at a topless bar had an arrangement with one of the dancers. After she got off work, he would meet her in back alley, where he would pay her \$50 to hug him.

The Schizotypal personality is fairly rare. She is often a street bag lady or a clairvoyant. The unreal is real for her, so her coping skills, as I have said before, are poor. I treated a Schizotypal young man who lived with friends for free, bouncing around from pad to pad. He offered psychic readings for his stays. His mother was a psychic, as well, from Jamaica. She was quite critical of her son, and was preoccupied with her importance as a clairvoyant.

Today, kids with skin issues are more visible and vocal and find each other more easily to create family. They have music which speaks for them. They communicate over the Internet. The most angry kids regularly produce angry art, including gore and dripping blood. The less angry ones often simply decorate their skin and their faces with tattoos, paints, and piercings. Some have a penchant for covering their own skin with leather, perhaps trench coats. Others want to show skin, especially tattoos and piercings. Some dye their hair with flamboyant colors and styles; do outrageous things to decorate themselves, while others shave their heads. I tend to

think the skin heads experience more abuse, talk of violence and hatred, or scapegoating at home, while the decorators simply continue to be ignored, perhaps rejected. They find one another and live on the periphery of the social world.

ABANDONMENT IS AS SERIOUS AS BRAIN-DAMAGING ABUSE OR MORBID NEGLECT, such as, being sent from one care giver to another, especially for weeks at a time. Such abandonment predisposes children to a sociopathic personality. There are great similarities between children who never bonded, who have been completely abandoned, and whose parents are cold and abusing behind closed doors and charming for the public. These children, and those with related backgrounds, learn it is unsafe to trust, and in most cases the children lack empathy, and often lack a conscience, as well. The lack of conscience creates a sociopath, especially if appropriate behaviors are learned for the public. Where circumstances are not quite so bleak, the child may grow up to have clinging or stalking behavior. In the best cases, where the child had some continuity of care givers, such as being left with a known relative, or the child was at least three or four when abandoned, the child may survive with a willingness to play by the rules, but a drive to distance from people emotionally. This person may not have lasting relationships or may not want too much touching or intimacy in his life.

Fairly decent parents can inadvertently harm their nine-month-old infant by taking a week-long vacation. This little baby will never trust again, as she was born to do. When mommy and daddy come back, she will refuse to make eye contact. They will try in vain to get her to look at them while she's in their arms, but she will not. Actually, the parents may not even notice. Most don't. Later, she'll look only long enough to get her needs met or to make her point. The next time they leave, she will not be upset. They may think she's adjusted. They may

even think proudly that she's more independent than most. They may conclude half-astutely that the vacations have made her independent. Actually, what's happened is that she will never allow herself to be vulnerable again.

Perhaps her parents believe that it's better to get a child to adjust to parents leaving on trips at a younger age than at an older age. These parents often express the belief that babies don't notice much or think much. However, babies experience such things to a far more excruciating degree, partly they're more sensitive and vulnerable, partly because the days are longer to an infant than to us, and partly because they don't know when, if ever, their parent(s) will return. They have learned at their core that there is nothing or no one upon whom they can rely. If they trust again, they will be hurt again. They will form their core personality around such events to protect themselves for the rest of their lives. Onlookers will assume their coldness is a genetic trait. Unfortunately, you can't show the parents a video of how warmly their child could have turned out *without* the vacation/abandonment compared to how coldly the child will turn out *with* the vacation/abandonment.

As a conservative rule of thumb, I advise parents of the One-For-One Formula. That is one day for each year of life or one day away for a one-year-old; two days away for a two-year-old; three days away for a three-year-old; four days away for a four-year-old; and five for a five-year-old. The most critical years are the youngest ones. A one-year-old may begin head-banging or withdraw into a corner rocking incessantly after two days. A nine-year-old may be able to handle two weeks relatively well. You may be able to send an eleven-year-old away for the most of the summer. I prefer to plan conservatively, because long-term, core personality formation is at stake. Regretfully, the greatest damage is often done in custody disputes or by

social workers who take children away to protect them from abuse.

SEPARATION ANXIETY EVIDENCES Milder DAMAGE THAN ABANDONMENT, THOUGH IT ACTUALLY LOOKS WORSE. These children preserve the need to bond, however insecure. Sometimes it's a desperate attempt to hold on. They cling or scream when the parent leaves the room. They may rage at the parent when the parent returns to pick them up from day care. The personality has become insecure, and later they will be clingy adults, perhaps willing to withstand on-going abuse to avoid living alone.

If the separation anxiety is severe, that is, the bonding was poor to begin with or, there have been less quality time or perhaps longer separations, the grown child may develop major clinging or stalking behavior. If the separations are long enough, or frequent enough, the child may become an island or a distancer. As previously stated, she may be sociopathic or severely disturbed if she endures major attachment breaks. There is no clear line of distinction on the continuum between separation anxiety and abandonment issues. When they overlap, the adults, as well as the children alternately cling, sometimes indiscriminately, and distance. They end up creating one abandonment after another in a sort of self-fulfilling prophesy.

If a child is insecurely attached or both parents work, the four-year-old may not be able to handle four full days away from her parents and under such excruciating pain will terminate the bond to his parents while they are gone. However, a securely attached four-year-old, who has never been left before, who has good communication skills, thoughtful parents who carefully explain their intentions, calling home and leaving notes, audio and video tapes, may be able to tolerate a week holding onto hope without a core change in personality. I wouldn't risk it. Even though the healthier four-year-old may hold out, he will still suffer excruciating emotional pain.

Some parents argue, "But I need a break." They have no idea the break they'll need when they have to parent a *damaged* child. If you do most everything right in the first five years--(1) good bonding, (2) secure separating, (3) unhurried and appropriate potty training, (4) reasonable and consistent disciplining, (5) and healthy modeling--then you should have a bright, ethical, low-maintenance child and a healthy, effective adult.

The fifth worst thing you can do to your child is to RIDICULE him or her. Next to that is REJECTION. This wound targets the child's identity, striking at the core. Ridiculed and rejected children sit on these wounds, because inherent in the injury is the message that the true self is shameful, and "you'd better learn to cover who you are, and make up something we want to see." Parents who deliver these messages don't distinguish between the child and his or her choices. You can persuade a child to change his or her choices without destroying the child.

I have recently heard from parent-callers to a local radio talk show that their students are being suspended from school pending further evaluation for having expressed empathy or understanding for students who killed for having been ridiculed. That students who have empathy for killer students might commit the same crimes is crazy reasoning! These administrators cannot differentiate between empathy for deep feelings of rejection as opposed to the actions born of those feelings. By that same standard, my son and I would both be expelled, as well as most of the remaining students of Columbine High School who have since self-reflected on the massacre.

After ridicule and rejection is neglect. A neglected child may look poor or may not seem very bright. They may be unaccustomed to conversation, interaction, exploring ideas, or even thinking. They have not enjoyed attention or care. They have not been seen or known. Most

educators just assume the child lacks intelligence. Actually, lack of stimulation does stunt intelligence. Usually, these children will just need to have their minds exercised. They need to start talking about their life, the world as they see it, how they feel, and who they are--to someone *interested*. They need to hear back feedback on their thoughts, as well as, how valuable they are.

As adults, they will fail to care for themselves. If their dental care was neglected, they will neglect their teeth. If they were neglected altogether, they will have poor health and hygiene and appear unkempt.

SEXUAL OR PHYSICAL ABUSE ARE OFTEN FOUND WHERE THERE IS A DOMINEERING PARENT. Perhaps, that's because in order to get away with sexual or physical abuse, one has to dominate the life of the child. But interestingly enough, these children may turn out healthier than severely neglected children, perhaps because negative attention is better than no attention or because children can recover from abuse if they are allowed to express their feelings. It's hard to recover from neglect. It's hard to put into consciousness what was never experienced. One can't get imagine empathy if they never got it. Abuse is as bad as we always knew it was. We just never realized how much more deadly the other parental sins were. Thus, those who are dominated and abused, but loved, don't have to turn out to be criminals, especially if they were allowed to cry. They could still attract love into their lives. They may become cops or prosecuting attorneys, instead. They might still need therapy as they may be prone to abuse their own children. However, they could still manage Anormal and productive lives. Perhaps, this is another reason why jurors often reject the so-called Abuse excuse , because many of *them* have suffered abuse, and *they* turned out to be law-abiding citizens. They intuitively understand that abuse, itself, is not enough to create a criminal, especially if they believe, AIt wasn't so bad,

and besides, I deserved it.

A child who is whipped so much that he decides not to cry, because that would give his parent satisfaction, is a child who has made, what I call, the sociopathic decision. A child who decides not to cry while being abused injures himself further. He hardens his personality, though he does not *necessarily* become a sociopath. Hitler was whipped daily and bragged that he didn't cry. In this way, he hardened himself and abdicated his own vulnerability. Yet, Hitler admitted that his worst memory was one in which he was ridiculed: His father came after him with the belt while he was in the bath. He jumped out a window while he was still naked onto the icy fire-escape, climbed down and huddling under a lamp post in the snow. His father leaned out the window, laughing and jeering at his naked son, harming him more than all the physical abuse combined.

A parent may be in for a big surprise when their over-controlled or dominated child becomes an adolescent. A child who was dominated according to the whims and needs of the parent is more volatile than a child who has been trained to certain and consistent rules. When the orders are not predictable, the child becomes more hard-wired to the dictates of another, and will not be good at thinking for himself. He will be good at following orders, disobeying orders, and at giving them. This same child is destined to become unruly in adolescence without intervention.

When parents have parented this way, I almost don't know what to tell them. It may be too late. The adolescent will not respect his parents, and he will rebel when he feels adult enough to do so. He will have internalized enough disrespect from the parent, that the parent will likely get back what the parent gave, unless the adolescent continues to live in fear of the

parent, like the Menendez brothers. However, fear only postpones the backlash from subjugation. As if to write his own epitaph, Jose Menendez told an associate, AI would rather be feared than loved.

The parent needs to apologize for his or her domineering behavior and listen to the child's feelings. Then, the parent's best hope is to make a contract, perhaps in writing. The parent needs to explain there will be new rules. The adolescent will not be dominated anymore, but neither will he be rescued from the consequences of his actions. Parents and teen will start fresh, perhaps with a rite of passage, a special dinner or a celebration. Ask the teen to write a speech about how he wishes to conduct his life. When the speech is ready, and the rebellion has been dropped from his intentions, you may want to ask him to deliver the speech formally, perhaps to important witnesses. The parent also makes a declaration that the teen will begin with privileges, many of which are normally earned. However, these same privileges can be also taken away if the adolescent makes reckless choices. The parent announces that he or she will be available to offer guidance upon request, but not to take away natural consequences.

On taking away a privilege, the parent will need to act swiftly and *silently*. No lectures, no ridicule. *Only consequences*. Try to take the one which relates best to the indiscretion. Big consequences are good, except don't take away rites of passage and once-in-a-lifetime events. Cancel Christmas, but not a prom. Don't over-do with a consequence that lasts too long, because the teen's life is passing by, and she needs to be left with hope that she can earn back her lost privilege. When consequences take too long, there's despair. When they're too small, there's disrespect for consequences.

Though the parent has offered to be available for conversation and guidance at anytime,

he or she needs to understand that their son will probably not come to them until he hits bottom. Then, the parent may only offer advice upon request. No more. Finally, the parent has to learn to let go, or he or she will lose their child altogether.

How one survives incest may depend on other factors. If the child feels safe enough with a parent or someone she can tell immediately, if the other parent believes the child and acts to protect her, the healing has begun. Hopefully, the child will enter therapy immediately, the perpetrator will be arrested, and the child will be assured it's not her fault.

The depth of the injury is related to how young was the child, how long it lasted, whether the molester was a parent or outside of the family, and whether or not the child was free to tell and experience protection from the parent. For example, a molested child who had relatively decent bonding and attention may survive the molestation without a confidante, coping as an adult, interacting with relative appropriateness. Obviously, for a parent not to notice something is wrong implies that the bonding was never *good*.

Many untreated victims of incest marry and have children, though the parental couple may have sexual difficulties, and the grown child will suffer daily until she gets to heal. Grown children who have never addressed their abuse often are attracted to mates with sexual issues themselves. It is somewhat common for these untreated adults to turn a blind eye to situations which put their children at risk, or, upon hearing from their child that he was molested, a parent may disbelieve the child or blame him. Most molested children have already been threatened and blamed by the perpetrator. How the other parent handles this situation will either compound or mitigate damages. Many molested children experience many of the injuries described above in the process of the molestation or in the course of their lives. This may be a complex injury.

Molestation by a neighbor is less traumatic than incest from a parent or step-parent. Trauma inflicted by a parent who is in the role of our provider and protector is far more injurious than trauma inflicted by a stranger or neighbor.

Some therapists actually believe that there is no such thing as repressed memories. They have no appreciation for the damage repression does or the healing expression brings. While I believe repressed memories may come to light, because I've witnessed it so many times in my office, I am equally certain that some therapists have agendas to find and even plant sexual abuse where there was none. My own caseload has proven the existence of repressed memories to me, as I use a technique which includes no suggestions whatsoever to the patient. I have treated men who were sexual addicts but didn't remember being molested until I treated them, and when they had processed *very specific memories*, often verifiable, the symptoms stopped. But, if I were not a clinician who had witnessed so many victims remember and heal, I would have to believe it if I read *Guilty By Reason of Insanity*, where Dr. Lewis documents cases of unconscious memories which were acted out. Alice Miller demonstrates in *For Your Own Good* and *Thou Shalt Not Be Aware* how unconscious memories are the drive behind criminal behavior. What you cannot tell, you re-enact. What you re-enact you can make conscious, if not remembered.

If the child victim of incest has been also profoundly neglected, she will have seriously destructive or self-destructive traits in adulthood. She may become a prostitute, re-enacting on a daily basis what happened to her. Or he may become a pedophile, especially if the incest began in infancy or as a toddler, lasted for years, and was frequent and particularly violent. The gravity of the pedophilia would be further enhanced if the victim was profoundly neglected and perhaps

abandoned, as well as threatened never to tell.

Eileen Wuornos was a neglected child who was molested by both her father and step-father, but it wasn't that bad, a variation on denial. She became one of few female serial killers. She used to hitchhike along major highways in Florida. If a man picked her up and was abusive to her sexually, she would kill him. If he wasn't abusive, she'd let him live, never knowing how close he'd come to dying.

It is important for the victim of incest to have justice. The therapist is mandated to report the crimes, with or without the patient's blessings. Confronting the parent is not essential, but may be ideal, especially if the family operates as if the perpetrator is more regarded than the victim. It may take months or years of therapy to prepare, as we are raised to honor our parents, no matter what. If the adult child is not asked to testify in court or refuses to do so, she will need to create some sense of justice, such as mailing a letter of intent to exile the offending parent from her life. If the parent is dead or gone, it will be important to still write the letter in order to get the feelings of betrayal expressed and out of her body. There are other ways to further purge the emotional pain, such as re-living the memory out loud to someone who will hear it all, by writing letters which have nowhere to go or by talking to an empty chair with a therapist.

FAILING TO SET LIMITS CREATES A "BRAT", LEADING TO A NARCISSISTIC MONSTER. It's from this parental failure that so many people derive the opinion that bad behavior is from a lack of discipline. In this case, it's really true. Usually the parent is weak or unable to perceive the child. Often people will think the parent is *so* sweet, loving or dedicated. Such a parent can remind me of a pre-school teacher who *Amakes nice* with children. *ANow*, now, we don't hit. That's fine, of course when you're talking to a child who has hit for the first

time. However, if you're on the second hit, *Amaking nice* sends the child the message that there's no one there strong enough to stop them. Further, and worse, there is no one who really *sees* or perceives them. To not be seen is a horrible experience, and it usually emanates from parents who are in their own fabricated version of reality regarding both themselves and their child. This child will have a drive to smash the veneer and to require parents to deal with the truth of them. But the more the parents decline to be in the truth with the child, the more the child assumes a superior role of disdain for his or her parents, as well as the world.

This is a child who needs to see your face **IN HER FACE** with a stern, disgusted voice. *ANo!* You will *not* hit! I will not *let* you be a bad girl! I will *stop* you! Then when the child tests the parent to see if that limit was real, the parent swiftly lift's the child away to sit in her room until she can come to tell you what she did wrong. Some children are so unmonitored, having parents who can barely manage their own lives, they will make flagrant attempts to be stopped, as well as to punish their parents for neglecting them. One 11-year-old child came to see me at the insistence of his mother's new boyfriend. The boy walked in wearing a t-shirt which said, *APimps rule!* His mother thought it was cute. Another child profiled on TV became a *Aspotter* for dealers when he was 11 as his divorcing parents had begun to use crack. Still another child became a *tagger* (writer of graffiti, usually an insignia) to get his father's attention. He tagged across the bridge near his house. After no mention from his father, he tagged on the concrete brick across the street. After no notice from his father, he tagged on their garage door. After his father said nothing, he tagged in their hall. When his father still said nothing, he tagged on his father's mirror in the bathroom. His father finally woke up.

Worse than weak limit-setting is inconsistent limit-setting. The parent will set a limit and

the child will test it. Then, the parent backs down or fails to set the same limit next time. Sometimes the parent just doesn't want to take the stand again because he knows the child will throw another tantrum. The child sees this and thinks the parent is weak, that all he has to do is wear the parent down. When the parent gets his courage up to set another limit, the child will have even more endurance, because the child has already had one success at wearing him down. Every time the parent fails to enforce the same limit, the child gets reinforced for persisting. Maybe the parent takes a tougher stand than last time, but ultimately gives in again or refuses to confront the next time, because each time the child is more unrelenting, certain that the parent's weakness is within reach, each time more angry than before that the parent will relent. The child becomes totally convinced to his core, as a personality feature, that there is no grown-up strong enough to set a limit he can take seriously. The parent has created a monster.

Almost no limit is strong enough to convince this child to give in. If the parent wants to reverse it, he will have to become like a priest who is willing to die to exorcize the demon in his parishioner. This parent will have to promise a trip to Disneyland which he is willing to deny (against a violent and lasting protest) or willing to grant, when the child learns to behave respectfully. These are not bribes. The trip to Disneyland is planned and begun as a family adventure and then aborted, as the bad behavior pops up, even if the tickets have already been purchased. The trip is planned again and again, until the child learns to treat others with respect. No backsliding. The same with going out to dinner or anything else. Nothing is too precious to the parent that they can't walk away from it. They need to plan to be able to give it up.

One parent consulted with me, because her daughter had tried to strangle another child. This was an over indulged child, whose parents so adored her that they had a hard time

disciplining her. She had a strong sense of superiority and entitlement. I suggested they take away Christmas (which was upcoming in about three weeks). The mother said, AI don't want to punish myself, too. I suppose I don't blame her, but if you're truly fighting for your child soul, you are willing to sacrifice. Most of these little narcissists become so, because the parents don't want to inconvenience themselves when it comes to discipline.

Choose your battles judiciously. Parents who are over-critical and over-controlling may create obsessive-compulsive disorders and children who are nervous and argumentative. The most important thing to punish is mean-spirited, selfish, rude, arrogant, or unethical behavior. I consider anything else a cry for help or a need for parental guidance into life-skills. Parents also need to allow natural consequences as often as is possible or reasonable. That prepares children for the natural consequences of life, especially in adulthood.

If you have waited until adolescence to take a stand, it is *almost* too late. Do not bother to argue, insult, lecture, whine, or guilt-trip your teen. She will tune you out *at best*. You can only give and take away. Don't over-do. Pick your battles. Give use of the car or a car for responsible choices (but keep the pink slip), or a telephone of her own, or a limousine to the prom, and take it back if your teen doesn't keep the bargain. Tell your teen in advance, perhaps with a signed contract, that if they fail to keep their part of the bargain the deal's off. Keep your word.

## **Imprinting:**

WHAT GOES IN MUST COME OUT. WHAT DOESN'T GO IN CAN'T COME OUT.

This is my theory of imprinting, in which we do digest the way we were treated, and if we don't give it back to our perpetrator, we dish it out to scapegoats. On a milder level, we simply treat

others the way we've been treated. For this reason, we can see how we are doing by watching how our children play. How we've been treated becomes our automatic pilot, if not our drive. It becomes our language and our culture. If things happen to us out of an abuse of power, we will seek power to re-enact and extract revenge. We have to be careful not to revel in this opportunity to attain power.

I was once teaching self-esteem to my son's classroom of kindergarten students. One little tough kid said, AI can't wait to grow up so I can beat up my kids.

Charles Manson's mother was a prostitute. He was raised in an environment of profound neglect, and he was probably chronically exposed to her sexploits, possibly even some of her Atricks. At the other end of the continuum, my biographer friend Joel's mom liked to worry over him with lots of prohibitions. She was a sort of prudish and prissy Southern lady. Once, Joel was interviewing Manson, who leaned forward and said to Joel, AGive us a kiss, to which Joel responded, wagging his finger at Manson, ANow, there'll be none of that. Manson leaned back in his chair and mused, AThat was your mother talking to my mother.

When I was in graduate school, the word Aimprinting was reserved for a phenomenon in nature. Ducks imprint off their mothers. That means that they imitate their mothers, and without that opportunity, they wouldn't do all the things that ducks do. If a human starts feeding the baby duck, the duckling will follow the human around, as if it was it's mother. They say that humans don't imprint. I assert that they do.

As well as Charles Manson sees it, I can see it. Most of us notice it. We catch ourselves in the mirror, or see ourselves doing something with our child exactly like our parents did with us. I'm talking about behaviors which are unique to our parents. I'm also saying that it isn't just

superficial imitation. It's totally *internalizing* the parent, including his or her speech, mannerisms, attitudes, and even philosophy of life. The degree to which we individuate from our parents may only be the degree to which we became an opposite of them, in some respects, just to break away. Nevertheless, many of their least desirable traits will show up when we least expect it. Sometimes the traits are wonderful and we live them joyfully, as Mother Teresa loved the selflessness of her mother. Sometimes the traits are negative, and we resolve, AI'll *never* do that to my child, but when our guard is down, out it comes. Sometimes, we notice a trait popping out and may hate it. Sometimes, we don't notice, or we simply assume it's normal. Other times, we embrace it. AIf it was good enough for me, it's good enough for my child.

We have all imprinted different material. Some of us have imprinted sexual and physical abuse, and thus have a *drive* to hurt others. Some of us have imprinted generosity, and thus have a *drive* to give. Some of us have imprinted superiority. Some, morality. Whatever we imprint is what we assume throughout the fiber of our being is normal, and we tend to think, even when we know better, that it's the way everyone is.

Thus, many of us can't even imagine why another person would do what they do. We admire them or we condemn them. Most of us have our unique drives, the ones we can't control. Some of us have a drive to molest children. Others have a drive to harm or kill. Others have a need to be neat, neat, neat and to clean, clean, clean. Some people simply have to scold people. Some people have to have impeccable manners. They just can't do otherwise, even if their life depended on it.

Once I simply asked Richard Ramirez, AHow are you doing? He answered me, APissed. Really pissed. Some days I wake up so angry I just know I'm going to get in trouble, and I know

I can't do a god damn thing to stop myself. I, personally, have never awakened that angry. I don't know what it's like. I've never had to control such an urge in my life, certainly not every day of my life. I think I'd get worn down.

## The Taboo against Healing:

THE NEXT WORST THING YOU CAN DO TO A CHILD IS TO REPRESS YOUR CHILD'S EMOTIONS when you have hurt them. The repression of a child's injured feelings is harmful to a child. No expression or venting of emotions; no healing. Thus, parents can create long-term harm by requiring their child to respect them and to think of them as good and wonderful, no matter how badly they have been treated. To add insult to injury, the parents can let the child believe that if they honor their parents enough, they might finally be good enough, loved and safe. When parents forbid him his feelings or point of view to serve the parents' emotional and identity needs, the child becomes trapped. When neglect, trauma, or abuse have been swallowed, an internal rage develops, which, upon being denied, becomes a time bomb, especially when the abuse is laid down over morbid neglect.

As a matter of fact, when the child has *not* suffered trauma, but is supposed to only express happy feelings, the child will still develop the inauthentic personality of the narcissist to please the parent(s). The positive thinking ethic in the family may cause fake or shallow communication and a lack of vulnerability or honesty. The child will learn to always be on. Even this child will harbor a hidden identity that she is a fraud, since she fears on some level that the empty and forbidden negative feelings inside make her bad or not good enough. What's

inside is a secret identity, which she is terrified others will discover. Repression harms anyone from any childhood.

Another couple of variations are the *insecure* parent who *needs* to be validated by the child and the *cold* parent who *requires* validation. The child learns to hold up a positive mirror to the parent that she is wonderful and loved if not respected at all costs. The parent may pout or rage if the child fails to idealize the parent. The former parent raises what my son, Scott, calls a Alight narcissist, while the latter raises a Adark narcissist.

Combined with the responsibility to act positively, the unseen child can harbor a forbidden depression. The grown child may later avoid or disdain anyone who contemplates the source of their negative emotions, their childhood, their feelings or whomever would want to solve problems in a relationship by Astirring it up. When a repressed child grows up, they will likely practice a repression ethic themselves. They will likely enforce it upon their child.

Any of these children may suffer a double whammy in that not only do they have to be positive for their parents' sake, but they may suffer the feeling that they are not seen for who they are. Children who don't feel Aseen suffer, and they suffer a lack of identity. Perhaps they don't suffer as much as the child of morbid neglect, but it is painful not to be known or seen for who you are.

Once I lived in an apartment which overlooked a busy intersection. The young man next door to me frequently leaned out his window to test whether the world could see him today. He whistled and waved at passers-by. When they responded by looking up, he would wave and give them the thumbs up. When they failed to acknowledge him, he would give them the finger and yell, AFuck you!

Similar to the child who always has to be positive, is a child who is not allowed to express any negative feelings or talk back lest he get scolded, swatted or even guilt-tripped. He may develop ADHD (Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, or actually, Attention Deficit Disorder, the Hyperactive Type). The agitation and inattentiveness which parents and psychiatrists try to medicate with Ritalin results when a child is sitting on forbidden emotions which make him chronically restless and distractible. Repressed emotions create a chemical imbalance which medication is designed to counteract. It might be much more responsible to allow the child to get the old feelings out and express current ones as well. Healthy people express feelings here and there, and they can listen to the feelings of another person without taking them on. Children and adults who have difficulty focusing, or who seem out of control, are not the ones who never learned to control themselves. They're the ones who have too much material to control. All of us have had the experience at one time or another of suffering an insult and then having to perform, nevertheless. Perhaps we had to teach a class, run a meeting, or meet an in-law just after we had been emotionally blind-sided. We all know how difficult it is to pay attention when there's something on our mind about which we can't speak. Depending upon how much we are repressing, it's difficult to focus or to "be ourselves" under such circumstances. Children Aout of control are repressing. Calm children are current with their emotions. They have no backlog. However, most people think the opposite, that calm children have learned to control their feelings, and unhealthy children haven't.

Repression creates damage to the personality which can be simply healed by releasing the forbidden emotions. When one receives permission to release these emotions, the real illness turns out to be the resistance to release or the ethic with which these feelings were held in. For

example, AI'm ugly when I cry, AMen don't cry, AI'll never be weak again, or, My parents can't be wrong, are internal messages that ultimately could forbid healing, unless they're broken through. Again, the more one represses, the more distorted is their thinking, their impulses and their judgment. The stronger are their drives to act out or explode. Repression always requires a lie which needs to be discovered and dismantled.

Just to clarify, I am not advocating that children should be allowed to disrespect, name-call, act rude, or anything of the sort. I would not tolerate it in a child *or* an adult, for that matter. I am saying that a child should be allowed to say with feeling, AWhen you leave, I feel sad. Mommy, please don't go. AWhen you forget to pick me up at school, I get mad at you, and I get afraid that you don't think about taking care of me. AWhen you don't notice me or come to my concerts, I feel hurt, really hurt. And, real crying (verses fake crying and whining) should be accepted. Perhaps a child needs to say, AWhen you belt me and punch me through a wall, I hate you. I hate you. I hate you." Then, they wouldn't need to harm somebody else one day. Unfortunately, such violent parents don't want to hear it. Those who will listen or allow it do far less damage. Thus, some abused children have fewer adult symptoms, because they had an outlet. Abusive parents who make amends may actually do less damage than repressive parents.

### **A Sample Case of Denial:**

Years ago a Rolling Stone article indicated that Ted Bundy had a weak mother who lived at home with her father and mother. The article said that Ted's grandparents were very strict and religious, and that Ted's grandfather had kicked him downstairs. How often there was violence

is not known. According to Ted's one-time friend and biographer, Ann Rule, Ted's unmarried mother gave him to her parents to raise as their own while she lived with them for four years pretending to be Ted's older sister, Louise. According to Rule's book, *The Stranger Beside Me*, Ted only bonded with his grandfather, who he thought was his father.

When Ted was four, Louise changed her mind and took Ted with her across country, so Ted suffered a major attachment break, always wondering why his Aparents\_ would let her take him away. Louise never told Ted she was his mother. However, he sometimes suspected it, especially when Louise married a man named Johnnie Bundy and Ted had to change his last name.

Louise was in charge of Ted's discipline, but she often allowed Johnnie to whip Ted with a belt. Often, in the childhood of a rapists, the mother requests it. The mother enjoys the role of having her husband defend or champion her. This betrayal, especially when it's a lie, leaves a bitter hatred for women in her son, in the legacy of a rapist. In any event, Ted's mother was a weak, selfish, and dishonest woman who allowed or invited her father and later, her husband, to hurt her son, while she never claimed him as her own.

As an adolescent Ted was reportedly shy and the subject of ridicule for his modesty during shower time after gym. There may or may not be something behind the modestly, but certainly ridicule was an ingredient in his growing rage.

Since Louise modeled repressed feelings, keeping secrets, false values, false roles for Ted, later Ted would take on different roles, lying to and manipulating different people with different stories probably daring people to stop him. I suspect he had a drive to outrageously fake people out and give them fatal consequences for believing him. This was probably something he

wanted to do to his mother subconsciously, but scapegoated other young women instead. He hated her for faking him out and for not being able herself to protect him or to ever see him or his needs.

Ted wanted to win over Stephanie, his first, perhaps only love, who, according to his own assessment, Aout-classed\_ him. After Stephanie rejected him, he was devastated. He obsessed over her for years, like someone who had been abandoned at an early age, as he had been. He had also developed a lack of conscience for the same reason. He worked for years to earn the status he needed to court Stephanie again, and then, when she responded, he dropped her coldly in revenge. Ted had developed a calculated, dishonest method to entrap and scapegoat women. Before the killings, Ann Rule, as a friend, asked Ted why he never confronted his mother about *her* dishonesty (or betrayal). In true serial killer ethic, he explained that he didn't want to hurt her. Serial killers always protect their parents. If they didn't, they wouldn't be serial killers. If they didn't, they wouldn't need to scapegoat.

Ted Bundy had in his childhood nearly every ingredient to create violence with the possible exception of neglect. Since Ted He suffered a (1) primary attachment break at the age of four, leaving him with no trust and no conscience. (2) He didn't feel seen. (3) He grew up in secrets, lies and deception day in and day out. (4) Everyone repressed the truth as well as their feelings, so, true to the pattern of killers, Ted protected his mother to the end, where he blamed pornography for his problems, just what the public wanted to hear. Ted's adult life was one of multiple roles, manipulating people and punishing people for failing to see him. (5) He had an abusive father/grandfather who we know kicked him downstairs. He had a (6) weak mother, who gave him over to her father and then her boyfriend/husband to discipline/abuse. (7) Despite all

this, he repressed his anger at his mother, as all serial killers do. That's one thing killers and psychologists have in common. Don't blame parents.

Ted's complete attachment break set the scene for an extreme degree of narcissism which amounted to sociopathy. Children who experience an attachment break, form an attitude that no one is the boss of them. Despite this belief, Ted suffered extreme ongoing beatings. He developed a total enraged disrespect for authority and women, which manifest in killing women too young to be mothers and daring authorities to catch him. After he committed a murder, he hung around the crime scene testing his infallibility and their inability to see him. Further he tried on the role of his own attorney, convinced by now no one, not even the judge could see or stop him, yet daring them to do so.

### **There's Nothing to Defend:**

I'm not writing about guilt or innocence of the parents, so we can find someone to blame. Sometimes the parent is a foster parent and has nothing to do with the original injury to the child. Sometimes the parent just had to die or had to be hospitalized for awhile, which certainly is not their fault. Sometimes the child had a serious injury in the first year of life and had to be hospitalized. I know one budding little sociopath who had to spend his first year in a body cast. Perhaps, if the hospital staff had understood how pain interferes with bonding, special measures would have been taken to enhance bonding, and the mother would have been advised to caress his face, whisper and gaze into his eyes while he suffered, and give lots of massages after the casts were removed.

We all know of Ted Kazinsky, the Unabomber, who was hospitalized at 5 months of age for several weeks in isolation for an allergy. Perhaps they thought he might be infectious. His family said he was never the same after that. Chances are the staff would have handled Ted's hospitalization differently if they had understood how devastating an attachment break is for a young child, especially a baby. Maybe they would not have thought isolation was worth it for a child so young. Unfortunately, most health care professionals know little about attachment issues and their impact on the formation of personality.

It's not about blaming the parents for how the child turns out. It's about *not* blaming the child. It's about letting the child get their feelings out so a child he can heal. It's about not being deliberately blind; so we can prevent rapists, killers, and massacres.

Let's say that no children are hospitalized, no parents die, and there are no foster parents. Let's say that all children get their pathology directly from the way their parents treat them. It's *still* not about blaming the parents. All parents make mistakes, and the mistakes they make come from *their* childhood. Those of us who suffered the worst and didn't get to heal are the ones who make the worst mistakes. That's why people need to be free to say, A\_I did this to my child, because that's how my parent's treated me. Now, I'm trying to reverse it. The moment a person takes responsibility for their mistakes and begins the reversal process, there is no one to blame. Even before they know about the damage they're doing, there's no one to blame. It's only when a person chooses to protect their own feelings about themselves over their very own child that we enter the Realm of Blame.

I've made the point earlier in this book that there are certain needs we have to have met to turn out healthy, and when they are not met, we are harmed. The results of that harm shows up

on the next generation. By the same token, when those needs are met well, then we turn out amazing, and there are almost no limits to what we can accomplish and create.

Thus, I'm saying there are two ways to make a personality disorder: One is universal. The other is particular. One is about bonding and secure attachments, safe separation, and patient potty training, are dependent upon universal needs and universal parental responses. The other is imprinting. How uniquely we are each treated, and how each of us has a different cross to bear or light to whine. We each have different parents and are treated differently. How we are treated will be basically how we treat others.

When basic needs are not honored and met in a child, then we are going to have a damaged personality, *and* when children are traumatized they will do harmful things to themselves and others when they grow up. No one is an exception. All of us are subject to these two conditions. It's possible to heal ourselves and our children, but it requires a major commitment. It's by far cheaper and easier to prevent.

None of this is about blaming the parents. It's about healing the child, including grown children. Unfortunately, in order to do that we usually have to get off protecting the parents, so can all heal, individually and collectively. We were all children, and we all had parents, so every parent is innocent even when they're hurtful or harmful. There is no one to blame and nothing to defend. However, once a parent gets defensive, they shut the door to healing. Therein lays the problem, really.

This is about taking responsibility for the next generation and stopping the chain reaction. There is no parent I respect as much as a parent who has done major damage but who wants to heal what they've done. I call this parent the True Parent, no matter how much harm they've

inflicted. On the other hand, if a parent is defensive and blames the child as the problem, no matter how little damage they've done, I call this parent a False Parent. They are willing to stigmatize their child in deference to their own pride.

This theory is not about blame. There is nothing to defend. This theory is designed to relieve children of the obligation of protecting their parents' egos that we can be safe on the streets.

### **The Greatest Taboo:**

There is a reason why we can't see what's in front of us to see. There's a reason why many trained psychologists, when interviewed on television about the sources of violence in our children, point to gun laws, drugs, video games, media violence, the news, lack of discipline, and Marilyn Manson's music one year as causes for violence and Ozzy Osborne's music the next. There's a reason why people recoil at the abuse excuse. There is a reason why such intelligent men as Ted Koppel compassionately wonder aloud (at the television town meeting between Littleton and Jonesborough) how it might feel to find out that the son you thought you knew was, in fact, a killer. There is a reason why ADHD (Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder) is so popular among parents and diagnosticians. It points at the child's make-up rather than parenting styles which inadvertently teach him to swallow his hurt feelings or her unnatural early years in daycare.

I have the impression that most of the professionals in my field think and speak of mental health problems as if there were nothing underlying them, other than chemical imbalances or

genetics. This is absolute nonsense, especially since teenage violence is growing along with the ADHD diagnosis. At one time the biggest problem in schools was cutting in line and chewing gum in class. Now it's drugs, violence, and kids who can't pay attention. These children did not develop an epidemic of genetic problems in a few generations. However, daycare has swept the country in a few generations. Psychiatrists and psychologists speak of depression as an illness which could strike anyone at any time, and that's not true. Depression results from buried sadness or anger turned inward. Such sadness cannot be held in indefinitely, and often a trigger or a letting down of a guard will bring it on, though still in a denial form. Anxiety attacks are the result of buried acute trauma, whereas obsessive compulsive disorder probably results from chronic early childhood trauma by hovering punitive parents. Etc.

I rarely have a patient who does not evidence fairly quickly the causes underlying their symptoms. If a trained eye looks for experiential causes behind symptoms, he or she can find them. Further, I never had a patient willing to know the truth behind their symptoms who didn't heal. That this is not common knowledge and common practice astounds me. I wonder that we are just beginning to exit the Dark Ages of Mental Health. If psychotherapists don't see it, how can we expect the public to see it. If psychotherapists don't see it, we *don't want to see it*, and we are acting out our own unconscious agenda to insure that none of us see it, or that those of us who do see get discredited. There's a major theoretical incongruence tolerated politely and sometimes impatiently in my field. Two major and opposing hypotheses exist upon which treatments are based. One proposes that behavior cannot be understood or explained, only modified by rewards, chemicals and constraints. The other proposes that behavior is easily understood when you're open to perceive it. Only the latter theory acknowledges the depth of

injury parents can inflict. The former colludes with the source of the problem, in my opinion.

Further, I find there is significantly less denial among family therapists than among psychologists and psychiatrists.

THERE IS A TABOO AGAINST SEEING WHAT A PARENT IS DOING TO HURT A CHILD. There is a taboo in each of us against seeing what our parents did to hurt us. Whatever we were not allowed to know or express has been driven into our unconscious and is thus manifest in drives to act out, re-enact, do to others what was done to us, self-destruct, or develop physical illnesses which the trained observer understands are specific metaphors for our injury. The untrained observer and the person acting out think the grown child is defective in some way or perhaps morally unchecked. Sometimes we carry so much forbidden feeling inside we must develop an inauthentic or fake personality. Sometimes, we simply have blind spots. Sometimes we hold so much pain against our own knowledge that we blow up for no apparent reason.

WHEN YOU HAVE A SOFT SPOT FOR PARENTS SUCH THAT YOU TOO ARE FORBIDDEN TO KNOW THAT PARENTS CAN AND DO DESTROY PERFECTLY GOOD AND INNOCENT CHILDREN, YOU TOO WILL BE CONFUSED ABOUT WHY VIOLENCE TAKES PLACE. You are simply in The Taboo.

### **The Source of All Evil:**

Evil comes from, and perhaps is only the *forbidden* rage against the parent for profound neglect, abuse, or abandonment. When a parent sins against their child and doesn't want to hear the crying or anger, they find ways to require the child to hide his injury. Such a parent is willing

to harm their child *and* refuse the mirror that there is anything wrong with how they treated the child. Thus, "If you don't stop crying, I'll really give you something to cry about," or "If you tell anyone, I'll kill you," or "If you don't like it, I'll leave you forever," or "You disgust me when you cry," or "You don't appreciate all that I do for you," or "Do as I say, not as I do." These are some ways a parent sacrifices their child for their own identity needs. More than likely, this is the way *they* were parented.

Yet, the parent cannot will away their child's feelings. He or she can only drive them underground where they build and compound. They putrefy, toxify, and intensify. However forbidden, they exist, hidden away, *until the child grows old enough to exercise power*. Still honoring the taboo, the child starts to scapegoat *others*, perhaps the same way he, himself, was scapegoated. The child becomes defined according to his acting out and his apparent inappropriate rage. The parent's ongoing scapegoating of the child becomes justified and often supported by others. Definitions and theories develop about the poor parent who has to have such a bad child. The child becomes seen as an evil child who deserves to be rejected. The child, who wants desperately to please his rejecting parent, will agree that he or she is evil. The forbidden anger within feels evil. This dedicated child rarely ever attacks or turns on his parent(s), which would be healthier or safer than scapegoating. So, the myth of the unsuspecting, innocent parent who couldn't help but raise a bad seed child goes on. Thus, no one honors his parents like a serial killer.

### **The Face of Evil:**

Evil is simply the choice to sacrifice another in order to accommodate one's own comfort. It stems from the original taboo, where the abusing parent, for comfort reasons and for his or her

own identity needs, requires the wounded child to Amirror\_ respect, including that the parent is good and wonderful. (I'm not defending a child's right to be rude to, disagree with, or disrespect a responsible parent.) Thus, a true parent sometimes needs to override his or her defensive feelings in order to hear out their child.

Since most of us have swallowed varying degrees of pain for our parent's sake when we were genuinely injured, most of us are capable of making varying degrees of evil choices as adults to accommodate our own sense of comfort, if not revenge. In the case of the religious mother who called her son Aevil\_ for telling on his father, family members who believed the son still invited their father to family functions. A bride's maid-of-honor had a one-night stand with the bride's fiancé and then let her best friend walk down the aisle without a clue to who or what she was marrying. A man refused to confront his best friend about their vacation plans to abandon their nine-month-old for two weeks, even though the man was a therapist and knew the child might never trust again and could even become sociopathic. A father who remembered how much his own father's whippings hurt him refused to get therapy and abused his child, instead. A mother allowed her father to baby-sit her daughter even though she remembered her father molesting her. A teenager looked on and didn't complain when she saw her boyfriend ridicule an unpopular kid at school. In each case the easy choice for comfort takes precedence over telling the truth and/or doing the right thing.

### **Essentials to Understand:**

Despite legal, psychological and religious definitions, reality is what it is and does what it does independent of our categories. There is nothing magic about the age of 18 or 21. Violence has nothing to do with reason or maturity. If anything, the effects of trauma are more hard-wired

in the adult. The adult capacity for reason, judgment and the ability to discern right from wrong cannot overpower imprinted drives which lie dormant waiting until the body is old enough to exercise power and seek retribution. These undeniable drives to scapegoat are formed in the early years and are spring-loaded to come out later when triggered. That is the human design. There's nothing that can be done about it, except to understand, prevent, and protect. However, those who don't sit on such intense drives as others pretend these drives could be overcome by morals and will, and thus, after age 18 we can punish without looking back. Please be clear. I don't want to set criminals free simply because they can't help themselves. I understand that it is essential to incarcerate dangerous people for the sake of society. I just take no pleasure in punishing or executing someone who became a criminal because society failed to protect them in the first place.

Scapegoating results when the trauma caused by a parent is not redressed and the parent is unapproachable. The parent is shielded by The Taboo, and the child's grievance is invisible, or the child is deemed to blame. When you can't give your anger back to the source, someday you will take innumerable scapegoat(s) when you are old enough to exercise power. That's the human design. It's an amazing design, because ultimately it forces us to self-reflect through The Taboo in order to be released from the results of our denial.

The solution and it's Apsycho-babble\_ is repugnant to those of us who would rather protect our parents unto death. They will protest vehemently about how wrong it is to indulge in Ablaming parents\_ instead of punishing perpetrators. They like things as they are just fine, thank you. But, this is not about blaming parents or *anyone*, because parents were children too. This is about prevention and healing. In order to heal, you have to get your pain out. If someone wrongs

us, we need to express our feelings, that's all. The bigger the wrong, the bigger the pain, the bigger the feeling, and the bigger the drive. The Keepers of The Taboo believe the grown child should do whatever they can to hold it: go to church, forgive their parents, pray, think positively, forget about it, let go of it, rise above it, practice morals and ethics, etc. But the body never forgets, and the drive doesn't go away. The drive for revenge needs to be returned to the source, and if it can't be expressed back to the parents symbolically in therapy, in journaling, in "empty chair work", or actually to the listening parents, then the grown child will scapegoat others.

The Keepers of The Taboo against "blaming the parent" or expressing the original pain believe the grown child should be forced to hold it one way or another. That's a damn strong Aprogram\_ we brought into our adulthood from our childhood which insists that the child protect the parent, no matter what the parent did to the child. Who's the grown up, anyway? Who can handle the feelings better? Some people actually believe that the child can hold the feelings from their trauma at the hands of the one upon whom they completely depend better than the adult-inflictor can handle the child's resulting feelings. And, after all, isn't that what God meant when He said, AHonor Thy Father and Thy Mother?\_ I think not. That's a huge assumption and a wrong one that children can handle more than the parent or that children owe so much to the grown-ups.

Any of us still protecting our parents inadvertently take scapegoats. Parents will favor one child over another. Children will ridicule other children. A neglected and chronically molested child will grow up to molest. Cops will lose control. A supervisor will treat an employee like she's stupid, and parents justify their parents by treating their own child similarly to the way they were treated. Some people actually stalk executions, collect souvenirs, and send

up fireworks when the lights grow dim at the prison, replicating the stages of a serial killing, while hollering, *Let me* throw the switch!

Each of us has had the scapegoating experience, and each of us is prone to believe our drive to scapegoat is different and reasonable. Any drive to scapegoat is believed to be a righteous drive by the one who has it. Each of us has done something out of control. The degree to which we have gone out of control versus how well we can control our actions is the degree to which we were free to express our feelings whether or not we were well-parented.

Because of early childhoods which are more traumatic than we can imagine, some of us have drives to retaliate which are so strong that others of us cannot fathom them. We can't comprehend what it might be like to live with such rage day in and day out. We can't imagine what it's like to feel so hopeless, worthless and despised and to hate back so intensely.

The key is to reduce the drive, not to punish it, shame it, or preach at it. Any of these would be experienced as ridicule. Sermons would be unlikely digestible and would probably seem like hypocrisy, at best. Moral and ethical lessons won't register until the drive is reduced and the aging child experiences compassion and empathy from someone.

Unfortunately, by now the child has become a magnet for ridicule. I call such a child the Adouble damned, because he endures the neglect and abuse and then is later hated for how it made him become. When he acts out violently, as he will have to do since he never received help, our own denied rage will enjoy judging him and look forward to punishing him, since we, ourselves, are not immune to the scapegoat drive.

Just as we loathe to Ablame parents, we also love to punish. Somewhere in between the neglect and abuse of an adorable little child and his growing up without intervention, the victim

becomes the perpetrator. For generations and millenniums we have failed to see cause and effect, because *the transition is our blind spot*. We like the illusion that *we are better*, that given the same circumstances we would have come out of childhood somehow immune to the effects of buried trauma, that we are the good guys to be protected from these bad guys (which were never protected by us). Or, we like to think that if they had been punished more, they would have turned out well-behaved. Or perhaps, most of us like to believe that some children are just bad seeds we can self-righteously love to hate. It's their fault that they were born evil, and it's to our credit that we weren't. Perhaps it's the luck of the draw. We get to be the good guys. They get to be the bad guys. Then, we get to play us against them. Only it's real, and real people get hurt. Real people die. Real people take revenge.

There are some who have an intuition that there's something we should be doing. Some come close to getting what the problem and the solution must be. They're thinking something like tough love should happen. Since, by high school, most of these kids are dangerous, I'd prefer they be identified and put in a corrective school. But in that school there must be a focus on the original injuries to the child, on getting the feelings out, and offering empathy and compassion, while setting clear rules and limits, as well as consequences. Without catharsis of the original injuries there will be no healing, only a delayed time bomb.

*After* the drive has been reduced, it becomes essential to teach ethics and how personal responsibility works, what one's rights and responsibilities are in a relationship, and how to speak up and represent one's self. These concepts will be foreign at first, if not disagreed with. They are not in the damaged child's experience. One might think they're common sense. Look around and you will see that not only does blame and revenge permeate the lives of damaged

people and their friends, but it runs rampant in our own lives as well.

Any child who looks despondent or who seems *Amean* is not a bad seed. He is a child who is crying out for help. The way we have been thinking has given cover and comfort to dangerous parents. We have been part of the problem, because we are such loyal grown children ourselves. When we love and honor the truth, perhaps in the most profound way, we honor our parents. All children are our children. That means, we need to be willing to call children in at school when they evidence severe depression, disturbing drawings or writing, or isolation and despair. We need to be nosy about their home lives. All these killings give us permission to be nosy. Parenting is no longer a private matter. Please understand, I'm talking only about children who *clearly* evidence unhappiness. And, I'm saying, once we are rid of the *Abad seed* theory, we are responsible for seeing cleanly. It's actually easy to see.

On behalf of parents, I believe they are only the products of their own childhoods too. I don't blame them. I just identify them as the *ones who can make a killer or a doctor*, so to speak. If they're having trouble parenting, we need to help them. If they refuse help, then we need to take over or hold them responsible for refusing help. If they hurt a child, I don't blame them. However, if they deny the child the opportunity to grieve or to heal, I hold them responsible for the results of their choice.

### **Red Flags and Clues:**

Perhaps the reader would be interested to know what to look for and what clues there might be to warn of potential violence. Perhaps the reader might even like clues to identify children at risk when they are in elementary school, since the younger we intervene, the higher the possibility of healing the child and preventing problems. Perhaps the reader would like to

know how damage is reversible.

Fire setting and torturing animals are two of the most alarming red flags.

If I were administering an elementary school, I'd have a questionnaire for parents. I'd want to know about any major abandonments in a child's history, how parents discipline, how busy both parents are, and how parents feel about children expressing their feelings and opinions. I'd like to have all my children draw family portraits. I'd have my teachers write on the back of the drawings which children seemed the hardest, saddest, angriest, loneliest, most fearful, or most detached. If they were old enough, I'd have them write about who they are, what they like and what they hate, what they think about the most, what they would like to change, and what they love the most about their lives. I would phrase my questions in open-ended ways so as not to suggest the answer in the question.

Then, I'd ask the parents how they saw their children. I'd look for parents who were guarded, secretive, and hostile. I'd look for parents who saw their child differently than their child is. For example, if a parent of a sad or lonely child thought their child was well adjusted, I'd be concerned. If the parents of a sad child thought their child was trouble or difficult, I'd ask, When did you notice this (bad seed trait)? If they said, When he was a baby or Aa toddler, I'd be concerned that the child was put in the role of the scapegoat child, so I'd note a parent who disparaged their child. If the difficulty showed up later, I'd ask, What happened at that time? I'd be alert to physical abuse, including children who wear long sleeves in warm weather (possibly to hide bruises). I'd be alert to a parent who indicates that they are not available to their child. I'd be alarmed if a parent never showed up for school functions, and I'd take roll at these functions and keep records available for all the child's school years. I'd look for parents

who don't believe children should get to express their feelings. If more than one of these traits shows up in the same parent, I might inform an administrator that we need to keep an eye on how this child develops and perhaps arrange help.

If help was offered and parents refused, I'd wish there was a law that said parents who refuse therapy for the family and/or the at-risk child will be hereafter fully liable for the child's actions or will have to give the child up. The child left in the home of a parent who has been forewarned may be the subject of increasing abuse or threats (to make him behave/repress). This child should be visited in school on a somewhat regular basis to insure he has no bruises. His medical records should also be monitored.

In assessing damaged children, you need to know that if you ask the average child or the healthier child what he doesn't like about his parents, he'll be happy to tell you. The more damaged children are, the more they will tell you there's *nothing* wrong with their parents, and on further questioning they may reveal there's something wrong with them, instead.

In my field, one observes again and again that where there is one parental sin, there are usually others. With any of these, there's usually family secrets, and so on.

I'm not recommending we institute evaluating parents across the board. That offends my own sense of freedom and privacy. I'm only recommending that staff at school be knowledgeable about how to identify red flags and thus be alerted for necessary interventions. I'd recommend that a record of red flags be kept on each child at the school for reference just in case a long enough list develops to warrant intervention, that is, calling the parents in to talk. I am not convinced that all interventions should be by Children's Services. I think there should be interim interventions at the school. I also trust panels to make assessments rather than one

person.

In high school, perhaps even in junior high or middle school, clues to morbid neglect are available to be seen in Askin issues. If one wants to know who's a walking time bomb, it's not hard to know. These clues are apparent in the way the students present themselves. There are valuable ways for injured children to express and reach out when they know no other way to do so. Most gothics or skin heads are not killers, but they may still be suffering feelings of isolation or despair, and if ridiculed enough, they could become killers. Some are simply creative types and a bit rebellious. Nevertheless, school counselors and teachers should get to know and understand these kids in order to have a window on their emotional state. They also need to ask how they are being treated by their peers. Do they have friends? What do they share in common with their friends? Have they suffered any ridiculing? How did it feel? How did they handle it? Are they and their friends estranged from other larger groups of students. How are their grades? Ask to see their art or their doodles. Have English teachers require at least three essays a year on family life and/or about how students feel about themselves.

In unhealthy families, each child is treated differently, and one child may be afforded hero status, while another child is scapegoated. As a matter of fact, in such families, it would be extremely unusual for each child to be treated Aequally. Ironically, this disparity often causes officials to *discount* parenting problems, since parents have raised one child who is so high functioning. Further, school staff need to understand that most families of children-at-risk for violence look normal on purpose and are not forthcoming about what happens behind closed doors. However, upon interview, they could begin to seem quite cautious or hostile.

Also, extremely religious families are often thought to be safe environments. However, if

there are other clues to maltreatment, extreme religiosity can compound the effects of trauma. There is such a thing as religious abuse, which takes many forms. Hard as it may be to imagine, religious precepts which are normally valuable to the formation of character can be used in such a way as to terrorize a child. I've seen a mother determine that her two-year-old had the devil in him, and thus he grew up with that as his core identity. I treated the child of a father who regularly molested his children and then required them to pray with him for hours every night to insure these children, who were guilty of seducing him, would not go to hell. I've known a mother who spent most all her time at church and refused to believe her son when he told her that his father incested him almost every time she left them alone together. The mother scorned, *Your father is a righteous man. You are an evil child.* An extremely religious parent may physically abuse the child in God's name. Clergy can help out by monitoring and helping obsessive parishioners to lighten up, for God's sake, and if possible refer them for parenting classes and therapy. If I were a school counselor and suspected neurotic religiosity or religious abuse, I'd probably call the minister, inform him or her of my concerns and leave it at that. Of course, the law states that if I have reason to suspect abuse, neglect, or failure to protect, I am mandated to notify Children's Services.

When teachers or peers at school ridicule children, they are at risk for retaliation, and certainly they are guilty of traumatizing a child. Ridicule is difficult even for healthy adults to handle. If authority figures or members of society ridicule the grown child, they can expect an explosion. Any employer or supervisor who ridicules as a management technique is also at risk for retaliation.

### **Heading Off Violence:**

If just one person, an enlightened witness (a la Alice Miller, *For Your Own Good* and *Thou Shalt Not Be Aware*), sees what's happening to the child and tells the child that it's not their fault, and the way they are being treated is wrong, the child may not need to commit violence.

Identify children at risk. It's not hard to do.

Assemble students together. Acknowledge that some of them have suffered a great deal of neglect. Tell them what it's like and how it makes a person develop. Tell them: Those of you who are hurting, help is here for you. For those of you who have not been harmed this way, you need to know that ridicule and rejection is intolerable to people, especially those who have been severely wounded. If you have no compassion, which means you, yourself, are damaged, then you ridicule at your own risk and put other students at risk too. Further, students need to speak up to any student who ridicules another. And remember, to fail to do so is, to make an evil choice, however insignificant it may *seem*.

Offer to educate the parents in parenting and give them therapy for their own childhood wounds, so they can stop scapegoating their child(ren). There are non-traditional, yet state-of-the-art therapy techniques which heal deep wounds. They include Rage work, Rage-reduction or holding therapy, and some other cathartic techniques which access and clear early childhood trauma without hypnosis or any other risk of therapist suggestion into false memories. Identify the therapists in your community who can do this kind of work for purposes of referrals. Identify funding sources who can help parents afford treatment.

If a child can complain about their feelings of betrayal, they may have a chance to heal. The hardest part is breaking through The Taboo which we all blindly share.

Consider offering a support group during or after school for these special-needs students to share their home-life and their feelings, as well as to create a caring group (Afamily\_) where they can learn relationship skills. If children have a record of problems or arrests, put them in a special school that has a more direct approach to healing the wounds of the entire family. This serves two purposes, it treats damaged children in time, and IT MAKES REGULAR SCHOOLS SAFE. Again, parents who refuse to cooperate should be held responsible for their children's actions or should lose custody of their children.

### **A Prediction:**

If we don't improve the bonding and attachment of our children, we are in trouble. To avoid trouble we need to educate parents *en masse* about the dangers of leaving our children for too long. In the case of an infant, that means only hours. We need parents to know that there's a problem with a nanny becoming Amommy.\_ That problem is that eventually Amommy\_ will abandon the child when she's no longer needed by the parents. On the other hand, if the care givers are various, the child will be insecurely attached.

I recently met the most beautiful baby boy. He was four weeks old, and his parents had done a wonderful job with bonding. He was nursing and both parents were with him around the clock. His gaze locked onto adults who spoke to him, and he flashed smiles of delight. I met him again at four months of age. He pushed away from anyone who held him and would only make eye contact if the gaze was far enough away. Nobody was going to get that close to him again. He had detached already. AWhat happened?\_ I asked. At first the parents indicated that they hadn't noticed a problem. I was perplexed, myself. Then, as the parents and I parted, the mother said, as if she had known all along, AI think it happened when I went back to work (at

three months).\_ What's so profound about this family is that she left her baby boy with his loving father who had been there all along. Nevertheless, this baby, who was nursing, saw mom as the one he needed and the one who betrayed him. His ability to trust was impacted where his personality will form. He may not become violent, because his parents are so loving, they will compensate him in many ways. But, he will never be the warm and secure, resilient adult he could have been. Instead, he became a dare devil, with his parents' support. He became Ripley's (Believe It or Not) Youngest Skateboarder.

I was a die-hard feminist and would still be, if I hadn't seen how important it is for children to have their mom's at home, at least until they start school. Fathers will do, if parents don't bait and switch. Of course, in my line of work, I have to find ways to help parents have well-attached children against the odds. It can be done, but it takes very perceptive and intuitive parents. Usually, it takes a little bit of training to teach parents these skills, because most adults don't know how to read a baby. However, one hour now of services will be worth more than 1000 hours when the child is an adolescent or an adult.

If we don't solve the problem we're creating, we may see such a fundamental change in the American culture we couldn't recognize ourselves. We will have more and more violent criminals, and we'll have to build more and more prisons to house so many of our damaged teenagers for life.

I have been teaching this material to parents for over sixteen years. I started teaching bonding when most of the public never heard of it. My students have literally had to go on faith that I knew what I was talking about, because their relatives and even therapists were differing with me, even advising them to take breaks from their young children.

Germany had a popular parenting instructor and created a nation of sociopaths (Nazis) by adhering to the parenting advice of Dr. Schreiber. He taught parents to implement strict discipline. He taught parents to be cold, and to beat the spirit out of their children, lest their children suck the spirit out of them. After the beating, the child should be made to say, "Thank you, father." Dr. Schreiber's son grew up to be the famous paranoid judge or hanging judge. He was institutionalized and known to complain that the psychiatrist in charge was trying to molest him.

When Sigmund Freud's career was young and vital, he addressed a gathering of his peers and brilliantly reported a discovery he had made: Histrionic (shallow, emotional, and flirtatious) women who obsessed over sex or complained of incest memories or fears had likely been molested by their fathers. Freud's Seduction Theory caused him to be widely discredited in his field. For nearly ten years he languished in professional banishment.

Freud came back after a decade with another theory. He suggested that these women had *fantasies* of having been incested. Psychiatrists could, nevertheless, treat the patient as if they believed them, even though they didn't. Freud's future theories about Oedipus and Electra complexes, internal drives, etc were designed to bolster this proposition.

As if to test Freud, he was asked to review the case of the hanging judge and his complaints that he was threatened by his own doctor. Freud reported that homosexual fantasies may be the result of having needed more attention from his father. Freud passed the test. He did such an excellent job that he never even checked into the childhood of Judge Schreiber. There was no mention about the abuse to which the paranoid judge had been subjected or that it was plausible that the judge was projecting onto his doctor the experience he'd had at the hands of his

father. (I, personally, wouldn't rule out the validity of the judge's complaint regarding his psychiatrist.)

If my field had not frightened Dr. Freud back into popular theory, perhaps he would have scrutinize the parenting of Dr. Schreiber; perhaps he would have taken a stand on how dangerous that theory might be to the future of Germany. Ten years after the holocaust people still speak as if they're mystified about where that sociopathic Nazi movement came from.

Insecure attachments can create children equally as damaged, if both parents work and children are raised in day care. This is because insecure attachment is as bad, if not worse, than strict discipline and abuse, and we just as vigilante as ever about not wanting to scrutinize the parenting of parents. I suspect that equally as well protected is the notion that women must not be kept at home by any sexist theory.

I'm not advocating that women be kept home. I am advocating however, that if you're going to have children, plan on one of you staying home continuously in the day time, and if that person works, they work nights or in the home (which is very tricky), and that you perhaps alternate shifts at home.

If both parents must work, we need to make sure that the worst separation problems our children know are the daily longing these children have to see us at night and on week ends. There should be no weekend trips away from our children. When we're with them, we need to know them, to guide them, to accept them, to enjoy them, and to *see* them. Another problem with both parents working is that the child is indulged out of guilt. I don't object to giving a lot to children. The Kennedy's gave a lot to their children, and many of them went on to greatness. This problem is that when parents feel guilty, they don't mind bad behavior. They accept rude,

unethical behavior. They indulge greediness. They even think bossiness is cute and a sign of self-esteem.

The children who suffered abandonment in the early years or an insecure attachment are at extremely high risk for killing in a jealous rage. The children who are morbidly attached are also likely to resort to violent retaliation as a result of ridicule. Children who have insecure attachments may lack empathy for others and may be obsessed with getting their own needs met. Insecurely attached children may have exorbitant needs to manipulate and to lie to protect their emotional interests. Or they could be prone to isolation, paranoia, stalking, blaming behavior, or an inability to comprehend personal responsibility.

In Germany the damaged children grew to be cold, methodical, people who lacked empathy or consciences. In America the damaged children will be time bombs.

## **In Conclusion:**

The preceding and available formulas have not been formally tested by research, but I'm betting they are accurate enough to prove my point. It might be the best money ever spent in mental health to afford studies on the childhood ingredients of violent children and adults, as well. These studies can help us prove or disprove for society and parents the detrimental effects of neglect, abandonment, and repression, as well as abuse.

These formulas refer to boys, because they are generic formulas generally describing boys. As each life is unique, the formulas may not be exactly specific to every case, as, for example, some serial killers may experience some of the childhood experiences of a mass murderer. Nevertheless, whoever applies these formulas to real people will see more clearly

where crime comes from. (I further suggest *Guilty by Reason of Insanity*, by Dorothy Otnow Lewis, M.D., *People of the Lie* by M. Scott Peck, M.D., any book by Alice Miller, M.D., and, perhaps, if you have a strong stomach, *The Long Road Out of Hell*, by Marilyn Manson.)

Since these ATeenage Time Bombs\_ result mostly from morbid neglect, abandonments, and intolerance to a child's feelings or complaints against the parent, the trend will worsen. We now have both parents out of the home, children raised in day care, and day care providers, as well as parents who, behind closed doors, have less tolerance for crying and screaming. The contradiction between our need to prevent massacres of our children and our need to idealize parents across the board will sooner or later come to a head, and then perhaps we will choose to see what is right in front of us to see.

As we prefer to punish rather than to find the cause and fix the problem, we are most comfortable assuming all bad behavior results from either innate evil or a lack of punishment. If my point is only briefly considered that parents make criminals inch by inch, day by day and year by year, one may apprehend that it is easier and more rational for healthy adults to make choices to prevent the injuries to children than for the badly damaged children to transcend their injuries, even or especially after they had to grow up.

Nature seems to work with ironies and opposites. When the most horrible things happen we have our greatest opportunities to understand why. Children have killed before, but a whole nation didn't need to understand. This massacre at Columbine High School may have prepared our culture to consider the answer we never wanted to hear. I shall remain in earnest hopes that our healthier children did not die in vain.

## How to Make a Teenage Time Bomb

Parent your child with morbid neglect and/or abandonment. Leave him alone in the crib and the playpen. Maybe change his diapers once a day. Let his milk curdle in the bottle, or let his head become flat from lying so long. Don't talk to him. Or, ship him off somewhere.

No touching, holding, loving or protecting.

No discipline. Or, discipline irrationally. No guidelines. No boundaries.

Do not model personal responsibility in any way.

Blame others and always defend yourself.

Model scapegoating behavior. Pick a group of people upon whom you can look down.

Scapegoat your child, as well.

TRIGGER: Ridicule from peers.

## How to See Trouble Coming:

### **Look for ASkin Issues**

Babies who have not been touched or held in the first three months of life or perhaps have never been held, who were raised in cribs and play pens, grow up with fixations on skin.

Symptoms of ASkin issues include:

- cravings for leather (hide)
- cravings for satin (like skin)
- fixations on fingernails
- extreme hair styles
- excessively long or darkly painted nails
- includes shaving head
- tattooing (excessive)
- piercing (excessive)
- make-up and paints (excessive)
- cross-dressing
- nudism
- Anudie bars
- attraction to mannequins and blow-up dolls
- Avampirism \*

Some types of people who have skin issues:

- schizoid personalities, who have detached from others and have a mechanical approach to life
- schizophrenics, who may feel no physical sense of self (skin boundary), of where they end and others begin, and who, thus, fear thought-broadcasting to others or that others can read *their* mind
- heroin addicts
- skin heads
- gothics

Some people who evidence skin issues:

- |                     |                    |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| Highest functioning | Lowest Functioning |
| Dennis Rodman       | Jeffrey Dahmer     |
| Marilyn Manson      |                    |
| Alice Cooper (?)    |                    |

\*AVampires , as they call themselves, more than any of us, have been deprived of human touch in the early years. They have a thirst and taste, even a hunger, for flesh and blood. Some cut or bite, and often the cutting is done by the volunteer to avoid inflicting pain. Historically, it has taken place in secrecy involving oaths of loyalty. In recent years, with the advent of gothics, some vampire teenagers have formed clubs. Some of these have managed to commit crimes of violence. One murder case was recently covered by Court TV.

## **Other Killer Formulas\***

### **How to make a mass murderer, the father's job**

Relentlessly reject your son and ridicule him.

Severely abuse him. Punish him with cruelty. Dominate him. Shame and diminish him.

Ambush him until he is paranoid.

Model no remorse or personal responsibility, including apologies or self-reflection for wronging others, and hold a super-privacy, anti-therapy philosophy.

TRIGGER: Father figure, such as an employer, supervisor or teacher, fires, demotes, exposes, humiliates, or chastises the grown child.

### **How to make a serial killer, the mother's job**

Provide for blows to the head so severe as to create brain damage.

Neglect your son emotionally, but expect loyalty from him.

Torture him from infancy and throughout his childhood. Ridicule and humiliate him.

Swear him to secrecy. (Later he would rather be executed than betray you.)

Smother him with religious warnings.

Sexually abuse him overtly or covertly by exposing him to sexual relationships between yourself and other men.

Tell him he and all men are bad, and blame him along with all men for all your victimization.

Prevent him from having a meaningful relationship with a male figure.

Blame him for how you treat him.

TRIGGER: Any symbolic representation for the grown child's mother or her enemy and the opportunity to re-enact her particular kind of abuse.

## **How to make a Avampire \***

Parent your child with morbid neglect and abandonment. No touching or holding the infant. Leave in the crib and the playpen. Create Askin issues. (See attached.)  
When the child gets older, suck him dry.

Lean on him emotionally; tell him your darkest, ugliest thoughts and wishes; make him your emotional spouse, extract loyalty from him against your enemies, including his father.

## **How to make a gang member**

Both parents are essentially absent.

AZero-parent children find one another for family and adopt the values of their missing parents.

Parents are poor and uneducated.

Parents resent achievement because it threatens them. Parents reward ignorance.

Goals threaten them. Good grammar is scorned.

Parents have a victim-ethic, rescuing and defending one another, inviting self-destructive and destructive people into their home with an open door policy.

Parents have a blame ethic, and see people as either with them or against them.

Parents punish violently and inconsistently.

Parents are self-destructive, resorting to prostitution to survive, stealing to survive, welfare to survive, and abusing substances to survive, or so they think.

\*Historically, vampirism has involved the exchange of blood (including voluntary cutting) as well as oaths of loyalty and secrecy. In the context of today's society there is an increase in this phenomenon. Possibly as an outgrowth of the more accepted gothics, and probably *not* an outgrowth of Satanism, vampires have become more open. Court TV covered a recent vampire murder.

## **AWhy? and The Forbidden Answer**

Music is not the cause, only a visceral way to feel understood and validated, possibly addressing a drive for retribution. The Media is not the cause, and censorship is not the solution. Guns are not the cause, only a tool for existing rage. Video games are not the cause, only a means to vent. Suggestions of how to vent in a bigger way are all around us.

No amount of Boy Scout training, Christianity or any other religious or ethical training can heal the cause, only mask it for a little longer, until the explosion.

Killers are not given to us as someone we can self-righteously love to hate.

We become hard-wired not to hear the answer to our question, AWhy? We are not allowed to know the cause. Many of us are raised to idealize parents or to believe that all bad behavior out there is because parents have not punished enough. We like to picture all families are normal, or, especially, all parents are safe. We may actually assume bad children come from normal parents!

The more damaged a person is, the more they will insist *they* are the problem and their parents are fine, perhaps even saints.

**PARENTING IS THE CAUSE, BUT NOT SIMPLY BECAUSE PARENTS FAIL TO DISCIPLINE.**

*This is not about blaming parents* instead of the perpetrators. It is about understanding the results of childhood trauma and its latent effects. It's seeing how to prevent making killers and how to save children in time. This is about realizing that none of us would have survived the same childhood without the same insanely violent drives. **Any** child raised these ways without mitigating factors has no choice but to turn out the same way. This is not philosophy. This is cutting edge psychology. The parents of killers were children too, who were *made*, not *born*.

This is not about an abuse excuse. It's about prevention. Violent people, once made, must be kept out of social circulation.

We no longer get to assume parenting is exclusively a private matter. We have the personal responsibility to identify these children and to help them and their parents, because they affect us and they are part of us and our community. If parents refuse help, we may need to hold them legally responsible for their children's actions.

There are no bad seeds. There is no killer gene. Killers are made, not born.

## REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, Mary D. Salter (1978). *Patterns of Attachment*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- American Psychiatric Association (2000). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Fourth Edition Text Revision (DSM-IV-TR)*. Washington, DC: APA.
- Appelbaum, Paul S., Uyehara, Lisa A., and Elin, Mark R. (1997). *Trauma and Memory: Clinical and Legal Controversies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barker, Elliott (2000). The critical importance of mothering [Online]. Available: [www.naturalchild.com/elliott\\_barker/mothering.html](http://www.naturalchild.com/elliott_barker/mothering.html)
- Barkley, Russell (1997). *ADHD and the Nature of Self Control*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- \_\_\_\_ (1999). *ADHD, Ritalin, and Conspiracies: Talking Back to Peter Breggin*. Plantation, FL: Children and Adults with Attention Deficit Disorder.
- Belsky, J. (1986). Infant day care: a cause for concern? *Zero to Three*. Washington, D.C.: Bulletin of the National Center for Clinical Infant Programs. *Bulletin of the National Center for Clinical Infant Programs*, VI(5).
- Bowlby, John (1969). *Attachment, Volume I*. New York: Basic Books.
- \_\_\_\_ (1980). *Attachment and Loss, Volume III: LOSS, Sadness, and Depression*. New York: Basic Books.
- \_\_\_\_ (1988). *A Secure Base*. London: Basic Books.
- Brazelton, T. B. (1986, October). A speech to parents at the Auraria Higher Education Center, Denver, CO.
- Breggin, Peter (1991) *Toxic Psychiatry*.
- \_\_\_\_ (1998). *Talking Back to Ritalin*. Maine Common Courage Press.
- Brown, Daniel, Schefflin, Alan W., & Hammond, D. Corydon (1998). *Memory, Trauma*

- Treatment, and the Law: An Essential Reference on Memory for Clinicians, Researchers, Attorneys, and Judges.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Burlingham, D., and Freud, A. (1944). *Infants without families.* London: Allen & Unwin.
- Cermak, T. L. & Brown, S. (1982). Interactional group psychotherapy with adult children of alcoholics. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 32, 375-389.
- Cline, Foster W. and Holding, Cathy (1999). *Can This Child Be Saved? Solutions for Adoptive and Foster Families.* Franksville, Wisconsin: World Enterprises.
- Coyle, Mike (2004). Quid veritas est? *MindNet Journal – Vol. 1, No. 16b*;  
<http://www.mindcontrolforums.com/mindnet/mnll5b.htm>
- Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.* – U.S.--, 113 S. Ct. 2786, 125 L. Ed.2d 469 (1993).
- DeGrandpre, Richard J., and Hinshaw, Stephen P. (2000). ADHD: Serious Psychiatric Problem or All-American Cop-out? *Cerebrum: The Dana Forum on Brain Science*, 12-38.
- DeGrandpre, Richard J. (1999). *Ritalin Nation: Rapid-fire Culture and the Transformation of Human Consciousness.* New York: W. W. Norton.
- Dutton, Donald G. (1995). *The Batterer: A Psychological Profile.* New York: Basic Books.
- Ellenberger, Henri F. (1970) *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry.* New York: Basic Books.
- Fairbairn, Ronald. D. (1954). Observations on the Nature of Hysterical States. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 27, 106-125.
- False Memory Syndrome Foundation. (1995a). *Amicus curia brief filed with the Supreme Court of Alabama in the case of Mc/dyffue v, Sellers-Bok* (No. 1940524).
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1995b). *Amicus curiae brief filed with the Supreme Court for the State of Rhode Island in the cases of Heroux v. Carpentier (Appeal No. 95-39 and Kelly v. Marcantonio (Appeal No. 94-727).*

- \_\_\_\_\_ (2004). Scientific and Professional Advisory Board.  
<http://www.fmsfonline.org/fmsffaq.html>.
- Fonagy, Peter, et al. (2002). *Affect Regulation, Mentalization, and the Development of the Self*.  
New York: Other Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2001). *Attachment Theory and Psychoanalysis*. New York: Other Press.
- Freyd, Jennifer (1996). *Betrayal Trauma: The Logic of Forgetting Childhood Abuse*.  
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1993). Theoretical and Personal Perspectives on the Delayed Memory Debate.  
*Proceedings of the Center for Mental Health at Foote Hospital's Continuing Conference:  
Controversies around Recovered Memories of Incest and Ritualistic Abuse, August 7,*  
Ann Arbor, Mich.: Tape available from Sidron Foundation (410) 825-888.
- Galves, Albert, et al. (2002). *Debunking the Science Behind ADHD as a Brain Disorder*,  
[www.prozactruth.com/article\\_debunking.htm](http://www.prozactruth.com/article_debunking.htm).
- Giovacchini, P.L. (1990). Regression, Reconstruction, and Resolution: Containment and  
Holding. *Tactics and Techniques in Psychoanalytic Therapy* (p226-263). Northvale, New  
Jersey: Aronson.
- Graham, William A. (Director) (1969). *Change of Habit* [Motion picture]. With E. Presley and  
M. T. Moore. United States: MCA.
- Guntrip, H. (1962). *The Schizoid Compromise and Psychotherapeutic Stalemate*. *British  
Journal of Medical Psychology*, 35, 273-286.
- Harlow, Harry F., and Zimmermann, Ronald R. (1959). Affectional responses in the infant  
monkey. *Science*, 130, 421.
- Heinicke, C., and Westheimer, I. (1965). *Brief Separations*. New York: International  
Universities Press.
- Herman, Judith (1992). *Trauma and Recovery: The aftermath of violence—from domestic abuse*

- to political terror*. New York: Basic Books.
- James, Beverly (1994). *Handbook for Treatment of Attachment-Trauma Problems in Children*. New York: The Free Press.
- Karen, Robert (1998). *Becoming Attached: First Relationships and How They Shape Our Capacity to Love*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Karr-Morse, Robin and Wiley, Meredith S. (1997). *Ghosts from the Nursery: Tracing the Roots of Violence*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Klein, M. (1958). On the development of mental functioning, in *Envy and Gratitude and Other Works, 1946-1963*. New York: Delacorte Press/Seymour Lawrence.
- \_\_\_\_ (1953). Some reflections on The Ortesia, in *Envy and Gratitude and Other Works, 1946-1963*. New York: Delacorte Press/Seymour Lawrence.
- Koplewitz, Harold (1997). *It's Nobody's Fault: New Hope and Help for Difficult Children*. New York: Random House.
- LeDoux, J. E.; Romanski, L., & Xagoraris, A. (1991). Indelibility of subcortical emotional memories. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 1*, 238-243.
- Levy, Terry M. and Orlans, Michael (1998). *Attachment, Trauma, and Healing: Understanding and Treating Attachment Disorder in Children and Families*. Washington, DC: CWLA Press.
- Levy, Terry M. (2000). *Handbook of Attachment Interventions*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lieberman, A.F. & Pawl, J.H. (1988). Clinical implications of attachment theory. *Clinical implications of attachment* (J. Belsky & T. Nezworski, Eds.) Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lipton, Bruce (2001). Nature, Nurture and Human Development. [www.brucelipton.com](http://www.brucelipton.com).
- Los Angeles Times, January 8, 1990.
- Loftus, E.F. (1995). (1995, March/April). Remembering dangerously, *Skeptical Inquirer*, pp.

20-29.

- Loftus, Elizabeth & Ketchum, Katherine (1994). *The Myth of Repressed Memory*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Loftus, E.R., Polonsky, S., Fullilove, M.T. (1994). Memories of childhood sexual abuse: Remembering and repressing. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18, 67-84.
- Leo, Jonathan (2000). *Skeptic*, 8(1), 63-69.
- Lowen, Alexander (1990). Why Are You So Angry With Me? *Reclaiming the Inner Child*. Jeremiah Abrams, editor. Jeremy P. Tarcher, Inc.: Los Angeles. 183-188.
- \_\_\_\_ (1972). *Depression and the Body: The Biological Basis of Faith and Reality*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Magid, Ken and McKelvey, Carole (1987). *High Risk: Children Without a Conscience*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Main, Mary (1995). *Attachment theory: Social, developmental and clinical perspectives*. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
- Main, M. and Solomon, J. (1990). Procedures for identifying infants as disorganized/ disoriented during the Ainsworth Strange Situation. In: M. Greenberg, D. Cicchetti, and E. M. Cummings (Eds.), *Attachment during the Preschool Years: Theory, Research and Intervention* (pp. 121-160). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Main, Main and Weston, Donna R. (1981). *The Place of Attachment in Human Behavior*, eds. Collin Murray Parkes and Joan Stevenson-Hinde. New York: 1982.
- Masson, Jeffrey Moussaieff (1986). *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fleiss: 1887-1904*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- \_\_\_\_ (1984). *The Assault on Truth: Freud's Suppression of the Seduction Theory*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- McHugh, P. (1993a). Procedures in the diagnosis of incest in recovered memory cases. *False*

- Memory Syndrome Foundation Newsletter*. (May).
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1993b, October 1). To treat. *False Memory Foundation Newsletter*. (October).
- Miller, Alice (1981). *The Drama of the Gifted Child: The Search for the True Self*. New York: Basic Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1983). *For Your Own Good*. New York: Noonday Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1984). *Thou Shalt Not Be Aware: Society's Betrayal of the Child*. New York: Basic Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1988). *Banished Knowledge: Facing childhood Injuries*. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1990). *Breaking down the Wall of Silence: The Liberating Experience of Facing Painful Truth*. New York: A Meridian Book.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2001). *The Truth Will Set You Free: Overcoming Emotional Blindness and Finding Your True Adult Self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Parkes, Colin Murray, et al. (1991). Attachments and Other Affectional Bonds Across the Life Cycle. By Ainsworth, Mary D. S. in *Attachment Across the Life Cycle*. New York: Tavistock/Routledge.
- Peck, M. Scott (1983). *People of the Lie: The Hope for Healing Human Evil*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Perry, Bruce (2000). The Neuroarcheology of Childhood Maltreatment [Online]. Available: <http://www.bcm.tmc.edu/cta/Neuroarcheology.htm>
- Perry, Bruce (1997). Early Childhood Development and Victims' Rights [Video]. Presentation to the National Governor's Association (February 4). C-SPAN.
- Pezdek, K. (1995, November). *What types of false childhood memories are not likely to be suggestively implanted?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Psychonomic Society, Los Angeles.

- Pope, Kenneth S. & Vasquez, Melba J. T. (1998). *Ethics in Psychotherapy and Counseling*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., a Wiley Company.
- Pope, H.G. & Hudson, J. L. (1995a). Can Individuals “repress” memories of childhood sexual abuse? An examination of the evidence. *Psychiatric Annals*, 25, 715-719.
- \_\_\_\_ (1995b). Can memories of childhood sexual abuse be repressed? *Psychological Medicine*, 25, 121-127.
- Prescott, James (2000). Birth and the Origins of Violence: Perspectives on Violence [Online]. Available: <http://www.birthpsychology.com/violence/prescott.html>
- Putnam, F. W. (1997). *Dissociative Disorder in Children and Adolescents*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Read, John; Perry, Bruce; Moskowitz, Andrew; and Connolly, Jan. (Winter, 2001). The Contribution of Early Traumatic Events to Schizophrenia in Some Patients: A traumatogenic Neurodevelopmental Model.
- Reich, Wilhelm (1945). *The Sexual Revolution: Toward a Self-Governing Character Structure*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Rothschild, Babette (2000). *The Body Remembers: The Psychophysiology of Trauma and Trauma Treatment*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Ruskan, John (1993). *Emotional Clearing: Releasing Negative Feelings and Awakening Unconditional Happiness*. New York: R. Wiley & Co.
- Salajan, Ioanna (1982). *Zen Comics II*. Rutland, VT: Charles E Tuttle Co., Inc.
- Schore, Allan N. (1994). *Affect Regulation and the Origin of the Self*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- \_\_\_\_ (2001). The Effects of Early Relational Trauma on Right Brain Development, Affect Regulation, and Infant Mental Health. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 22, 201-269.
- \_\_\_\_ (2002a). Dysregulation of the Right Brain: A Fundamental Mechanism of Traumatic

- Attachment and the Psychopathogenesis of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 36, 9-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2002b). Advances in Neuropsychoanalysis, Attachment Theory, and Trauma Research: Implications for Self Psychology. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 22, 433-484.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2003a). *Affect Regulation and the Repair of the Self*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2003b). *Affect Dysregulation and Disorders of the Self*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Schwartz, P. (1983). Length of day-care attendance and attachment behavior in eighteen-month-old infants. *Child Development*, 54.
- Siegel, D.J. (1999) *The Developing Mind: Toward a Neurobiology of Interpersonal Experience*. New York, London: Guilford Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2001). Toward an Interpersonal Neurobiology of the Developing Mind: Attachment Relationships, 'Mindsight,' and Neural Integration. *Infant Mental Health Journal*. 22(1-2), 67-94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2002). Attachment and Self-Understanding: Parenting with the Brain in Mind. Conference on "New Developments in Attachment Theory: Applications to Clinical Practice." 2003 UCLA Extension and Lifespan Learning Institute.
- Solomon, Marion. (March 8-9, 2003). *Treating the Effects of Attachment Trauma*. Excerpted for: New developments in attachment theory: Applications to Clinical Practice, UCLA.
- Solomon, Marion F. and Siegel, Daniel J. (2003). *Healing Trauma: attachment, mind, body, and brain*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Spitz, Rene A. (1949). The Role of Ecological Factors in Emotional Development in Infancy. *Child Development*, 20(3): 145-155.
- Stern, Daniel. (2000). *The Interpersonal World of the Infant*. London: Basic Books. (Original

- work published 1985)
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2003). Attachment and Intersubjectivity. Conference on New Developments in Attachment Theory: Applications to Clinical Practice. UCLA Extension and Lifespan Learning Institute.
- Stosny, Steven (1995). *Treating Attachment Abuse: A compassionate Approach*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Summit, Rolland (1994). The Dark Tunnels of McMartin. *The Journal of Psychohistory*, 21(4, Spring), 397-416.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1983). The Child Sexual Abuse Accommodation Syndrome. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, Vol. 7, pp. 177-193.
- Taylor, Madeline S. (1996). *Taboo On Tenderness: The Rise and Suppression of Relational Concepts in Early Psychoanalysis*. Unpublished Dissertation, Ryokan College.
- Teicher, Martin (2002, March). Scars That Won't Heal: The Neurobiology of Child Abuse: Maltreatment at an early age can have enduring negative effects on a child's brain development and function. *Scientific American*.
- Thomas, Nancy (1998). *Rebuilding the Broken Bond, Part I for Reactive Attachment Disorder* [video]. Glenwood Springs, CO: Nancy Thomas. *Timmons v. Indiana*, 584 N.E. 2<sup>nd</sup> 1108 (Ind. 1992).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1997). *When Love is Not Enough: A guide to Parenting Children with RAD-Reactive Attachment Disorder*. Glenwood Springs, CO.: Families by Design.
- Underwager, R & Wakefield, H. (1991). Cur alii, prae aliis? (Why some, and not others?) *Issues in Child Abuse Accusations*, 3, 179-193.
- van der Kolk, Bessel, et al. (1994a). The Body Keeps The Score: Memory and the Evolving Psychobiology of Post Traumatic Stress [Online]. Available: Trauma Information Pages: <http://www.trauma-pages.com>

- van der Kolk, Bessel; McFarlane, Alexander; Weisaeth, Lars (eds.) (1996). *Traumatic Stress: the Effects of Overwhelming Experience for Mind, Body & Society*. New York: Guilford Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1994b). Childhood Abuse and the Loss of Self Regulation. *Bulletin of Menninger Clinic*, 58(2), p. 145-167.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1995). The Body, Memory, and the Psychobiology of Trauma. In Judith L. Alpert (Ed.), *Sexual Abuse Recalled: Treating Trauma in the Era of the Recovered Memory Debate*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson Inc., 29-60.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1989). The Compulsion to Repeat the Trauma: Re-enactment, Revictimization, and Massochism. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 12(2), 389-411.
- Vaughn, B. E., Gove, F. L., & Egeland, B. (1980). The relationship between out-of-home care and the quality of infant-mother attachment in an economically disadvantaged population. *Child Development*, 51.
- Watson, John B. (1972). *Psychological Care of Infant and Child*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1996). *Traumatic Stress: The Effects of Overwhelming Experience on Mind, Body and Society*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Welch, Martha G. (1988). *Holding Time: How to Eliminate Conflict, Temper Tantrums, and Sibling Rivalry and Raise Happy, Loving, Successful Children*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Whitfield, Charles L. (1995). *Memory and Abuse: Remembering and Healing the Effects of Trauma*. Health Communications, Inc., Deerfield, Florida.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1953). Transitional Objects and Transitional Phenomena – A Study of the First Not-Me Possession. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 34, 89-97.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1958). Primary Maternal Preoccupation (1956). *Collected Papers: Through Pediatrics*

*to Psycho-Analysis*. New York: Basic Books.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1960). On communicating and not communicating leading to a study of certain opposites. In: *The Maturation Processes and the Facilitating Environment*. New York: International Universities Press, 179-192.

Wylie, Mary Sykes (2004). The Limits of Talk Therapy: Bessel van der Kolk wants to transform the treatment of trauma. *Psychotherapy Networker*, January/February, 30-38.

Zeanah, C.H., Mammen, O.K. and Lieberman, A.F. (1993). Disorders of attachment. In C.H. Zeanah (Ed.), *Handbook of Infant Mental Health*. New York: Guilford Press.