

Testimony of C.A. Childress, Psy.D.

“Flying Monkey Testimony”

This is an excerpt from testimony. Case specific material is not included. The testimony cited here begins at the end of cross-examination. Redirect begins by referencing earlier cross-examination testimony.

Cross-examination by Ms. [REDACTED]

Q. OKAY. AND MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THE - I GUESS THE LABEL, THE LABEL THAT YOU USE FOR WHAT YOU HAVE BEEN INDICATING IS YOUR CONCERN WITH MOTHER IN THIS CASE IS THAT THERE IS ATTACHMENT-BASED PARENTAL ALIENATION, IS THAT CORRECT?

A. I USE THAT LABEL FOR THE GENERAL PUBLIC, YES.

Q. OKAY. NOW -- BUT THE APA HAS REJECTED YOUR THEORY OF ATTACHMENT-BASED PARENTAL BASED ALIENATION, CORRECT?

A. NO THAT'S NOT. I HAVE NO THEORY, AND THE APA HAS NEVER REJECTED ANY THEORY OF MINE.

Q. IS IT YOUR PERCEPTION THAT THE APA -- WELL, LET ME TAKE A STEP BACK. ON JUNE 6, 2018 YOU PRESENTED THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION WITH A PETITION REQUESTING A CHANGE TO THE OFFICIAL APA POSITION STATEMENT ON PARENTAL ALIENATION TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE PATHOLOGY OF A NARCISSISTIC BORDERLINE PERSONALITY PARENT SURROUNDING DIVORCE EXISTS, CORRECT?

A. CORRECT

Q. AND WHEN YOUR PETITION THAT THERE BE AN OFFICIAL CHANGE IN POSITION BY THE APA, DID THAT OCCUR?

A THE APA HAS NOT RESPONDED TO ANY OF THE ELEMENTS OF THE PETITION, INCLUDING THAT ELEMENT. THERE WAS MORE TO THE PETITION, AND IT HAS NOT RESPONDED TO ANY OF THE PETITION.

Q AND SO YOU -- IN 2018 YOU PETITIONED FOR A CHANGE AND THAT HAS NOT YET HAPPENED, CORRECT?

A THERE HAS BEEN NO RESPONSE FROM THE APA IN ONE WAY OR

	ANOTHER, THEY HAVE NOT ACCEPTED, THEY HAVE NOT REJECTED, THEY HAVE MADE NO RESPONSE TO IT.
Q	AND YOU HAVE INDICATED THAT -- YOU HAVE STATED THAT IN YOUR OPINION THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION IS ALLOWING THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN, CORRECT?
A	IT IS COLLUDING WITH IT BY COVERING UP SOME ETHICAL ISSUES IN FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY, YES.
Q	IN FACT, YOU HAVE ALLEGED THAT IN EVERY DAY SINCE THE APA HAS FAILED TO RESPOND TO YOUR REQUEST WITHIN THAT PETITION, THEY ARE COMPLICIT WITH CHILD ABUSE, CORRECT?
A	THAT'S CORRECT BECAUSE WE HAVE A DUTY TO PROTECT AND WE'RE NOT PROTECTING THE CHILDREN; THAT'S CORRECT.
Q	AND ARE YOU AWARE OF THE -- ARE YOU AWARE OF AN ORGANIZATION CALLED THE NATIONAL COUNSEL OF JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES?
A	I AM NOT PERSONALLY AWARE OF THAT, NO.
Q	ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY JUDICIAL ORGANIZATION THAT SUPPORTS THE USE OF PARENTAL ALIENATION WHEN IT'S IN CUSTODY AND VISITATION?
A	I'M NOT ATTENDING TO THE USE OF PARENTAL ALIENATION AS A CONSTRUCT, NOR WHAT THE JUDGES OR COURTS FEEL RELATED TO THAT CONSTRUCT.
Q	I'M JUST -- IF I COULD HAVE ONE MOMENT. I'M JUST TRYING TO LEAVE THE SCREEN SHARING SO THAT I CAN SEE DR. CHILDRESS, SO BEAR WITH ME.
	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THAT'S FINE. GO AHEAD.
	MS. [REDACTED]: I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.
	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. [REDACTED]:
Q	SO MS. [REDACTED] HAD SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT A PRESENTATION FOR WHICH CONTINUING EDUCATION UNITS MIGHT HAVE BEEN WITHDRAWN, AND I THINK YOUR ANSWER WAS THAT YOU DIDN'T HAVE DIRECT KNOWLEDGE OF IT BUT THAT YOU HAD

	RECEIVED INFORMATION ON IT. DO I HAVE THAT CORRECT, SO FAR?
A	YES, CORRECT.
Q	OKAY. AND WHAT PRESENTATION WAS THAT?
A	I WENT TO THE ASSOCIATION OF FAMILY, ASSOCIATION FAMILY AND -- IT'S THE AFCC, A NATIONAL CONVENTION BACK IN BOSTON WITH A PROFESSIONAL COLLEAGUE, MS. PRUTER, SHE IS A COACH, A BUSINESSWOMAN, AND SHE HAS A WORKSHOP THAT RECOVERS CHILDREN FROM THIS TYPE OF COMPLEX TRAUMA AND CHILD ABUSE. AND SO SHE AND I WENT BACK TO CO-PRESENT THAT DAY. I PRESENTED CAUSAL -- THE CONSTRUCT OF AN ATTACHMENT-BASED MODEL OF PARENTAL ALIENATION, APPLIED ATTACHMENT SYSTEM KNOWLEDGE, AND FAMILY SYSTEMS KNOWLEDGE, AND TRAUMA KNOWLEDGE, PERSONALITY PATHOLOGY, TO DESCRIBE THE PATHOLOGY. AND THEN SHE PRESENTED OR WE PRESENTED ON THE HIGH ROAD WORKSHOP, WHICH IS A RECOVERY WORKSHOP FOR CHILDREN IN COMPLEX TRAUMA AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CHILD ABUSE.
Q	OKAY. AND DO HAVE YOU ANY AWARENESS AS TO HOW CONTINUING EDUCATION UNITS BECAME AVAILABLE FOR THAT PARTICULAR PROGRAM?
A	NOT PARTICULARLY. THAT'S A FUNCTION OF THE CONVENTION. WE'RE PRESENTERS, SO THAT'S NOT A RELEVANT FACTOR FOR PRESENTERS.
Q	OKAY. SO THAT WAS NOT SOMETHING YOU WERE INVOLVED IN?
A	NOT AT ALL.
Q	THAT WAS NOT SOMETHING MS. PRUTER WAS INVOLVED IN?
A	NOT AT ALL. IT'S JUST SORT OF -- YOU'RE GIVING A PRESENTATION TO THE CONFERENCE, THE CONFERENCE GIVES CEU UNITS TO THE -- THE PEOPLE WHO ATTEND.
Q	OKAY. AND THEN HOW DID YOU SUBSEQUENTLY BECOME AWARE THAT THERE MIGHT BE SOME ISSUE WITH CEU UNITS WITH REGARDS TO YOUR PRESENTATION?
A	THERE WAS -- I -- IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN THROUGH MS. PRUTER. IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN THROUGH JUST -- THERE'S A GROUP OF PEOPLE WHO SEEK TO DISCREDIT MY TESTIMONY AND SEEK TO DISCREDIT

MS. PRUTER, AND SO THEY WILL IN BETWEEN CASES THEY WILL DO THINGS TO TRY TO IMPACT MY CREDIBILITY RELATIVE TO MY FUTURE TESTIMONIES, AND SO IT COULD HAVE BEEN THROUGH THAT. BUT JUST HEARING IT IN THE SOCIAL SURROUND, THE FACEBOOK, AND THE MEDIA THINGS -- OR IT COULD HAVE BEEN BY MS. PRUTER, WHO INDICATED THAT SHE HAD HEARD THAT THERE HAD BEEN COMPLAINTS, AFTER THE FACT, REGARDING -- AND MY -- MY UNDERSTANDING WAS THERE WAS -- BECAUSE MS. PRUTER WAS NOT A DOCTORAL PSYCHOLOGIST, I GUESS FOR NO REASONS -- I HAVEN'T HEARD THAT, BUT THAT SOME -- I GUESS THEY REVIEWED IT FOR SOME SORT OF TECHNICALITY. THEY SAID THEY DIDN'T WANT TO GIVE THE CEU UNITS TO THE PEOPLE WHO HEARD, BUT THAT'S -- THAT'S NOT RELEVANT TO ME.

Q OKAY. AND WAS THE PURPOSE OF THE PRESENTATION TO FACILITATE GIVING THE CEU UNIT -- WHEN I SAY THE PURPOSE -- I'M NOT ASKING YOU TO SPEAK ABOUT THE ATTENDEES. I'M TALKING ABOUT YOUR PURPOSE.

A MY PURPOSE WAS TO PROVIDE EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION TO THE PSYCHOLOGISTS AND LEGAL PROFESSIONALS WHO WERE ATTENDING THE CONVENTION ABOUT THE DIAGNOSTIC ISSUES AND TREATMENT RELATED ISSUES FOR THIS TYPE OF PATHOLOGY, AND TO EMPHASIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF ETHICAL PRACTICE, WHICH INCLUDES STANDARD 2.04 IN WHICH WE SHOULD BE APPLYING THE ESTABLISHED KNOWLEDGE OF PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, RATHER THAN MAKING UP NEW PATHOLOGIES LIKE PARENTAL ALIENATION OR ANYTHING THAT THEY'RE MAKING UP, AND SO THAT WAS MY INTENT. AND THEN ALSO TO INTRODUCE THE MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS AND LEGAL PROFESSIONALS TO MS. PRUTER AND HER WORKSHOP AND HER WORK TO RESTORE THE CHILD'S ATTACHMENT BOND IN A MANNER BASED ON (INAUDIBLE.)

Q OKAY. SO WAS THE CONVENTION -- I'M SORRY WAS YOUR PORTION OF THE CONVENTION WELL ATTENDED?

A IT SEEMED TO BE. WE HAD A FULL ROOM.

Q OKAY. HOW MUCH IS A FULL ROOM WOULD YOU SAY? HOW MANY PEOPLE WERE THERE?

A FIFTY MAYBE. JUST A ROUGH ESTIMATE, IT COULD HAVE BEEN A LITTLE BIT MORE SO I'M NOT NECESSARILY -- I DON'T KNOW. HOW MANY PEOPLE, YOU KNOW, IT'S HOW MANY JELLYBEANS IN A JAR.

Q RIGHT. OKAY. SO SOMEWHERE BETWEEN 15 AND 75, WOULD YOU

	SAY?
A	YEAH, IT WAS A -- IT WAS A -- A MODERATE CONFERENCE ROOM SIZE.
Q	OKAY.
A	IT WASN'T ONE OF THOSE BIG ONES NOR WAS IT A LITTLE ONE ROOM EITHER.
Q	I'M SORRY, WHAT -- AND WHAT? I MISSED THAT?
A	IT WASN'T ONE OF THOSE BIG CONFERENCE ROOMS, BUT NEITHER WAS IT ONE OF THE SMALL ONES. IT WAS A STANDARD, MODERATE CONFERENCE ROOM, PRESENTATION ROOM.
Q	OKAY. AND HOW -- DO YOU KNOW HOW IT WAS ARRANGED THAT YOU WERE INVITED TO BE A PRESENTER AT THIS PARTICULAR CONFERENCE?
A	THE PRESENTERS SUBMIT PROPOSALS, SO I SUBMITTED A PROPOSAL APPROXIMATELY SIX MONTHS EARLIER. THAT'S TYPICALLY THE TIME FRAME FOR THESE CONFERENCES.
Q	OKAY. YOU ALSO -- EARLIER WE HAD TALKED ABOUT YOUR TESTIMONY IN FRONT OF THE PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE. HOW DID -- HOW DID YOU END UP TESTIFYING THERE?
A	ONE OF THE -- A PARENT, ONE OF THE CONSTITUENTS OF ONE OF THE REPRESENTATIVES, BOUGHT THE ISSUE TO THE REPRESENTATIVE, THEY BROUGHT THE PARENT INTO THE LARGER COMMITTEE, AND THEN THE COMMITTEE EXTENDED AN INVITATION TO ME TO COME BACK AND PRESENT ON THE ISSUES.
Q	OKAY. I'M CURIOUS, HAVE YOU TESTIFIED IN FRONT OF OTHER GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES AS WELL?
A	NO. WELL, I'VE -- I'VE BEEN INVITED TO SPEAK WITH THE DUTCH MINISTRY OF JUSTICE WHEN I WAS OVER THERE, BUT THAT'S NOT TESTIMONY, THAT'S -- THAT WAS A MEETING. MS. PRUTER AND I WERE AT THAT MEETING AND SPOKE AT THE DUTCH MINISTRY OF JUSTICE.
Q	OKAY. YOU INDICATED THAT THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN MOTIVATED TO DISCREDIT YOUR TESTIMONY AND PRESENTATIONS. AND WHO ARE THESE PEOPLE?

A THEY'RE RANDOM PEOPLE. THE URBAN DICTIONARY DEFINES THEM AS "FLYING MONKEYS." THEY'RE ASSOCIATED WITH NARCISSISTIC PATHOLOGY AND YOU CAN KIND OF SEE THEM RIGHT NOW IN THE SOCIAL SURROUND, THEY HAVE THE SAME SORT OF CULT MIND GOING ON. AND SO THERE'S JUST A GROUP OF PEOPLE WHO INTRUDE INTO SITUATIONS BECAUSE THEY FEEL THEY'RE PROTECTING THE CHILD OR PROTECTING SOMETHING. AND SO THEY'RE MOTIVATED BY THIS PROTECTIVE DESIRE THAT'S NOT ESTABLISHED IN REALITY, AND THEN THEY -- THEY -- THEY INTRUDE INTO SITUATIONS.

Q ARE WE TALKING ABOUT LAY PEOPLE?

A YES.

Q OKAY. AND THESE ARE LAY PEOPLE WITH NAMES THAT SHOW UP WITH SOME LEVEL OF PREDICTABILITY AND FREQUENCY?

A YES.

Q AND ARE YOU ABLE TO NAME A FEW OF THEM?

A I DON'T ATTEND TO THEM, MS. PRUTER DOES. THEY MOSTLY SURROUND HER WORK BECAUSE SHE ACTUALLY RECOVERS THE CHILD, SO THEY ARE VERY MOTIVATED TO PREVENT HER WORK, SO THEY WILL ATTACK HER A LOT. BECAUSE I'M ASSOCIATED WITH THIS, THERE'S A GENERAL EFFORT TO DISCREDIT ME TOO BECAUSE I WORK WITH MS. PRUTER, AND THEY CAN'T DISCREDIT HER WITHOUT DISCREDITING ME, SO THERE'S -- I'M NOT OF AWARE OF THEM PERSONALLY. SHE HAD TO FILE LAWSUITS AND SEEK FBI PROTECTION ASSOCIATED WITH THAT THOSE TYPES OF ATTACKS.

Q ARE THESE PEOPLE WHO HAVE ALIGNED THEMSELVES WITH PARENTS WHO HAVE BEEN THE OBJECT OF PROTECTIVE SEPARATION FROM A CHILD IN MS. PRUTER'S PROGRAM?

A YES. AND THEN THEY JOINTLY SEEK TO GENERATE INFORMATION THAT WILL DESTROY HER CREDIBILITY AND MY CREDIBILITY SO THAT WE CAN NO LONGER PROCEED WITH OUR WORK.

Q OKAY. SO, IF I UNDERSTAND YOU CORRECTLY, WE'RE TALKING ABOUT PEOPLE WHO HAVE PERSONAL AND INDIVIDUAL ALLIANCES WITH PEOPLE COURTS HAVE FOUND TO BE ABUSERS SUCH THAT THE CHILDREN HAVE GONE TO MS. PRUTER PROGRAM?

A THAT'S CORRECT.

Q OKAY. IS MS. PRUTER'S PROGRAM GENERALLY -- THIS PARTICULAR ONE, THE ONE WHERE THEY RECOVER CHILDREN, IS IT TYPICALLY A PROGRAM THAT FOLLOWS FAMILY LAW, COURT ORDER OR A JUVENILE COURT ORDER?

A YES. IT REQUIRES A PROTECTIVE SEPARATION, BECAUSE WE DON'T WANT TO BE TRYING TO RECOVER A CHILD WHILE AT THE SAME TIME THE ABUSIVE PARENT IS TRYING TO KEEP THE CHILD DISTORTED. YOU NEED A PERIOD OF PROTECTION FOR THE CHILD. IT WOULD BE SIMILAR TO CUTTING OFF A TWITTER ACCOUNT WHERE WE DON'T WANT TO CONTINUE TO INFLAME THE PATHOLOGY AS WE'RE TRYING TO TREAT IT, SO -- SO WE GET A PROTECTIVE SEPARATION. THE ONLY JUSTIFICATION FOR PROTECTIVE SEPARATION OF THE CHILD IS CHILD ABUSE. IF THERE'S NO CHILD ABUSE THE PARENTS HAVE THE RIGHT TO PARENT ACCORDING TO THEIR CULTURAL VALUES, PERSONAL VALUES, AND RELIGION VALUES, SO IF THERE'S NO CHILD ABUSE, THERE'S NO REASON FOR A PROTECTIVE SEPARATION. SO FOR MS. PRUTER'S PROGRAM SHE RELIES ON THAT CHILD ABUSE DIAGNOSIS FROM THE MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS, AND THEN ONCE SHE RECEIVES -- OR BY COURT ORDER -- AND THEN FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER, THEN ONCE SHE HAS THE COURT ORDER FOR THE PROTECTION, THEN SHE CAN -- SHE INITIATES A WORKSHOP.

Q OKAY. I'M TRYING TO CONCEPTUALIZE, MAYBE YOU CAN HELP ME, A CIRCUMSTANCE WHERE THIS RECOVERY PROGRAM WOULD HAPPEN IN THE ABSENCE OF SOME SORT OF COURT ORDER OR CPS ACTION. IS THAT EVEN POSSIBLE?

A BY AGREEMENT OF THE PARENTS, YES.

Q OKAY. IS THAT SOMETHING THAT HAPPENS WITH SOME LEVEL OF FREQUENCY, WHERE THE PARENTS AGREE TO A PROTECTIVE SEPARATION AND RECOVERY?

A TYPICALLY THE PARENTS ARE -- IT CAN --- IT HAPPENS. I WOULDN'T SAY WITH SOME DEGREE OF FREQUENCY. BUT MS. PRUTER IS OPEN TO WORKING WITH FAMILIES IF THEY ARE OPEN TO SOLVING IT. AND SO IT MAY HAVE -- IF THE PARENTS ARE OPEN TO SOLVING IT, IT MAY NOT REQUIRE A PROTECTIVE SEPARATION BECAUSE IF THE ABUSIVE PARENT, OR THE ONE THAT WE ARE CONCERNED ABOUT, IF THEY ARE WILLING TO ALTER AND WORK WITH, THEN THERE ISN'T A NEED TO PROTECT AND AT LEAST NOT YET. AND SO WE WANT TO MONITOR THE SYMPTOMS OF THE CHILD, WE'D WANT TO PUT IT ON A CLEAR TREATMENT PLAN THAT WE SEE PROGRESS,

AND THIS IS WHERE IT'S AT WITH MS. PRUTER -- AND THEN MS. PRUTER CAN ALSO MODIFY SOME OF THE PRESENTATION OF IT. SO IF WE HAVE PARENTAL AGREEMENT, THERE IS A -- THAT'S A GOOD THING, BUT TYPICALLY, WE DON'T. THE PARENT DRIVES EVERYTHING TO THE WALL AND IT NEEDS A PROTECTIVE ORDER FROM THE COURT TO INITIATE AND REFER.

Q OKAY. AND THEN WHAT IS IT THAT THESE PEOPLE WHO HAVE ALIGNED THEMSELVES WITH FOUND ABUSERS, WHAT POSITION DO THEY TAKE? WHAT IS IT THAT THEY'RE DOING?

A WELL, THEY ATTACK, A LOT OF SLANDER AND LIES. A FREQUENT ALLEGATION INTERESTINGLY IS PEDOPHILES. YOU'LL SEE THAT ALLEGATION SHOW UP A LOT, PEDOPHILE, PEDOPHILE, PEDOPHILE. SO YOU'LL SEE IT SURROUNDING MY NAME. DR. CHILDRESS IS A PEDOPHILE, YOU'LL SEE IT SURROUNDING DORCY, OR WHOEVER IS SUPPORTING AND RETURNING KIDS TO PEDOPHILES, AND SO YOU'LL SEE THAT ALLEGATION A WHOLE LOT. AND THEN THAT'S PRIMARILY IT, BECAUSE IT CAN'T ATTACK ON CONTENT ABOUT ON THE CONTENT OF WHAT'S HAPPENING, IT'S PRIMARILY TO DISCREDIT US BASED ON OUR CHARACTER OR SOME ELEMENT THAT WE ARE UNSAVORY, PERSONAL BELIEFS.

Q OKAY. AND WHEN YOU SAID DORCY, THAT'S MS. PRUTER, DORCY PRUTER?

A YES, THAT'S CORRECT.

Q OKAY. SO WITH REGARDS TO THE CONFERENCE THAT MS. [REDACTED] ASKED YOU ABOUT -- AND I RECOGNIZE THAT YOU ARE LIMITED IN YOUR INFORMATION ABOUT IT, SO LET ME JUST ASK YOU. DO YOU HAVE ANY INFORMATION REGARDING INVOLVEMENT OF ONE OF THESE LAY PEOPLE WHO WOULD ALLY THEMSELVES WITH FAMILY ABUSERS IF ANY OF THEM WAS INVOLVED IN THAT PARTICULAR CIRCUMSTANCE?

A I CAN'T SPEAK TO THE NAME. I -- I THINK THERE WERE. I'M AWARE OF, YOU KNOW, A COUPLE. AND SHE'S NOT A LICENSED, BUT SHE HAS A DEGREE. BUT A PERSON WHO HAS A DEGREE --

MS. [REDACTED]: OBJECTION. NONRESPONSIVE

THE COURT SUSTAINED

Q OKAY. SO I'LL REPHRASE THAT THEN. DO YOU -- IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU HAVE AN AWARENESS OF AT LEAST ONE PERSON WHO WAS



	INVOLVED; IS THAT CORRECT?
	MS. [REDACTED]: OBJECTION. OBJECTION. LEADING. I DON'T WANT THE QUESTION REFRAMED. HE SHOULD ANSWER THE QUESTION THAT WAS ASKED.
	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
	MR. [REDACTED]: I DON'T EVEN REMEMBER THE QUESTION THAT WAS ASKED AT THIS POINT.
	MS. [REDACTED]: WELL, WE DO HAVE A REPORTER HERE.
	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. CAN YOU --
	MR. [REDACTED]: BUT I THINK MY QUESTION IS A REASONABLE ONE. SO THE QUESTION WAS -- I SORRY, DID --
	MS. [REDACTED]: OBJECTION. I OBJECT THE LAST QUESTION IS LEADING.
	THE COURT: OKAY. SUSTAINED. AND I'LL ASK THE COURT REPORTER, CAN YOU PLEASE READ BACK THE ORIGINAL QUESTION. (DISCUSSION BETWEEN THE COURT AND THE REPORTER.) (RECORD READ.)
	THE COURT: THAT WAS -- I BELIEVE THE WITNESS WAS SAYING HE COULDN'T HEAR BUT I DON'T THINK THAT WAS THE QUESTION. (RECORD READ.)
A	I'M VAGUELY AWARE OF THAT SPECIFIC EVENT.
Q	OKAY. IS THERE A PERSON WHOSE NAME THAT YOU KNOW THAT WAS INVOLVED IN THAT PARTICULAR CIRCUMSTANCE WITH THAT CONFERENCE?
A	YES.
Q	AND WHO'S THAT?
A	JEAN MERCER.
Q	JEAN MERCER. AND WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT JEAN MERCER?
A	THAT SHE HAS A DOCTORATE DEGREE IN EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY, I THINK. SHE'S NOT LICENSED, NEVER BEEN TRAINED IN

CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY, SHE'S NEVER BEEN TRAINED IN ASSESSMENT OR DIAGNOSIS OF ANYTHING. SHE TAUGHT AT A COLLEGE UNIVERSITY. SHE'S BEEN --

MS. [REDACTED]: OBJECTION. I OBJECT THE LAST QUESTION IS LEADING EXCUSE ME. I DON'T KNOW IF I'M THE ONLY PERSON HAVING THIS PROBLEM, BUT I AM NOT ABLE TO CLEARLY HEAR DR. CHILDRESS AT THIS POINT.

THE COURT: OKAY. AND I ACTUALLY COULDN'T --

MS. [REDACTED]: IT'S VERY GARBLED.

THE COURT: AND, MS. [REDACTED], WHEN YOU'RE SPEAKING NOW, IT'S REALLY GARBLED. I WAS ABLE TO HEAR BEFORE, BUT NOW -- NOW I CAN'T. ALL RIGHT. LET'S TRY TO GET-- AND I'M GETTING AN ECHO NOW ON MY SIDE THAT WASN'T THERE BEFORE. I DON'T KNOW WHY. (DISCUSSION BETWEEN CLERK AND COURT.)

MS. [REDACTED]: YES. WHEN HE STARTED ANSWERING, I JUST COULD NOT CLEARLY UNDERSTAND WHAT HE WAS SAYING ABOUT JEAN MERCER.

THE COURT: OKAY. LET'S TRY IT AGAIN. DR. CHILDRESS, IF YOU COULD JUST ANSWER THE QUESTION AGAIN, AND WE'LL SEE IF YOU'RE ABLE TO HEAR MS. [REDACTED].

A JEAN MERCER HAS A DOCTORATE DEGREE. I BELIEVE IT'S IN EXPERIMENTAL (INAUDIBLE.)

THE REPORTER: HUH-HUH.

THE COURT: OKAY. SO IT IS -- IT'S -- IT'S STILL -- SORRY, IT'S STILL CUTTING OUT. AND I'M GETTING THE ECHO BACK THAT WASN'T THERE A FEW MINUTES AGO. I DON'T -- LET'S SEE. MR. [REDACTED], HAVE YOU TRIED MUTING ON YOUR END. LET ME SEE IF IT'S -- IT'S STILL THERE. OKAY. LET ME TEST IT. OKAY. SO WHEN

YOU'RE MUTED, MR. [REDACTED], I DON'T HEAR THE ECHO ANY MORE.

MR. [REDACTED]: LET'S SEE IF THAT IMPROVES THINGS. I HAVE CUT MY VOLUME ON MY SPEAKERS TO A THIRD.

THE COURT: OKAY. LET'S TRY IT ONE MORE TIME.

A OKAY. SO JEAN MERCER IS -- HAS A DOCTORATE DEGREE IN I BELIEVE IT'S EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY. SHE RETIRED, BEEN RETIRED FOR MAYBE 10 YEARS--

MS. [REDACTED]: UH --

THE COURT: IT'S STILL -- IT'S STILL --

MS. [REDACTED]: AND THAT IS WORSE FOR ME.

THE COURT: AND IT -- I COULD HEAR YOUR TESTIMONY JUST FINE, AND THEN I COULD HEAR YOU. AND THEN WHEN MS. [REDACTED] INDICATED IT WAS GARBLED, THAT'S WHEN I REALLY COULDN'T UNDERSTAND MS. [REDACTED], AND NOW I SEE WHAT YOU'RE -- WHAT YOU'RE DESCRIBING -- NOW, I HEAR WHAT YOU'RE DESCRIBING, AND THE ECHO IS BACK.

Q MR. [REDACTED]: ALL RIGHT. LET'S TRY IT ONE MORE TIME WITH ME COMPLETELY MUTED AND SEE IF THE PROBLEM IS WITH ME.

A SO MS. MERCER -- JEAN MERCER HAS A DOCTORATE DEGREE I BELIEVE IT'S IN EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY. SHE IS A PROFESSOR OR WAS A PROFESSOR. SHE'S BEEN RETIRED FOR APPROXIMATELY 10, 15 YEARS, IS MY UNDERSTANDING. SHE'S NEVER BEEN LICENSED AS A PSYCHOLOGIST, SHE'S NEVER BEEN TRAINED IN THE ASSESSMENT, TREATMENT OR DIAGNOSIS OF ANYTHING. SHE HAS -- SINCE HER RETIREMENT SHE'S APPARENTLY SELF-APPOINTED HERSELF AS A PROTECTOR OF CHILDREN AND WILL INTRUDE INTO A NUMBER OF SITUATIONS IN A NUMBER OF CASES, OFFERING TESTIMONY THAT IS PROBLEMATIC FROM A PROFESSIONAL STANDPOINT. AND SHE WAS ONE OF THE PEOPLE INVOLVED IN GETTING OR ADVOCATING FOR THE RETRACTION OF THE CEU UNITS ON THE AFCC PRESENTATION.

MR. [REDACTED]: EXCUSE ME, JUST A SECOND. SO I'LL JUST MUTE AFTER EACH TIME I ASK A QUESTION, AND I THINK THAT WILL HELP THE PROBLEM.

THE COURT: IT WAS BETTER AND IT WAS CLEAR AND -- AT LEAST TO THE COURT'S SIDE. MS. [REDACTED], I THINK YOU WOULD AGREE FROM YOUR --

MS. [REDACTED]: YES, I AGREE.

Q HOW LONG HAS THIS BEEN GOING ON, THIS ISSUE WHERE SELF-APPOINTED PROTECTORS OF CHILDREN WHO HAVE ALLIED THEMSELVES

	WITH PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN FOUND BY COURTS OR AUTHORITIES TO PERPETRATED ABUSE, HAVE BEEN ACTING IN WAYS TO DISCREDIT YOU AND/OR DORCY PRUTER? HOW LONG HAS THIS BEEN GOING ON?
A	IT'S A SYMPTOM FEATURE OF PATHOLOGY, SO IT IS A CONTINUAL FEATURE OF THE PATHOLOGY. AND AGAIN, YOU WILL SEE IT IN CULTURAL SURROUND RIGHT NOW BECAUSE WE'RE IN THE SAME TYPE OF PATHOLOGY.
Q	RIGHT. IN TERMS OF THIS PARTICULAR SITUATION, WHICH HAS TO DO WITH YOUR WORK AND YOUR PRESENTATION, I JUST WONDERED HOW LONG THAT'S BEEN GOING ON? IN OTHER WORDS, HOW MANY YEARS?
A	IT'S A SOCIAL DISTRIBUTION FEATURE OF THE PATHOLOGY. IT ACQUIRES ALLIES TO HELP ATTACK THE OTHER SIDE, AND SO IT IS -- IT IS AS LONG AS THE PATHOLOGY HAS BEEN IN EXISTENCE, THIS HAS BEEN A SYMPTOM FEATURE OF PATHOLOGY.
Q	OKAY. I THINK I UNDERSTAND YOUR ANSWER, AND I UNDERSTAND IT AS A GENERAL ONE. I JUST WANTED TO KNOW HOW LONG YOU HAD BEEN EXPERIENCING IT AND PURSUANT TO YOUR WORK?
A	MS. PRUTER HAS BEEN -- WHEN I FIRST ASSOCIATED, ENCOUNTERED HER, ABOUT 2014 SHE HAD A VERY INFLAMED SOCIAL DISTRIBUTION FEATURE. AND SO AS SOON AS I BEGAN TO COLLABORATE WITH HER, IT STARTED TO ATTACK ME ON MY FACEBOOK PAGE. IT WASN'T NECESSARILY ATTACKING ME AT THIS POINT. IT WAS ATTACKING ME FOR BEING IN THE WAY OF THEIR ATTACKING MS. PRUTER, THEN -- SO THAT WAS ABOUT 2014, 2015. AND THEN RECENTLY, ABOUT 2017 OR 2018, IT'S TURNED ITS ATTACKS MORE DIRECTLY TOWARD ME, AND SO NOW YOU'LL SEE IT'S ATTACKING ME WITH SPECIFIC SLANDERS AND THAT SORT OF THING.
Q	JUST A SECOND, AND I'LL MOVE ON TO ANOTHER QUESTION. HOLD ON A SECOND. OKAY. SO ARE WE TALKING ABOUT -- FOR SO LONG AS YOU HAVE BEEN INVOLVED WITH ISSUES THAT INCLUDED PARENTS WHO HAVE BEEN FOUND TO BE ABUSERS, THAT THAT'S HOW LONG IT'S BEEN GOING ON? IN OTHER WORDS, AS LONG AS WE'VE HAD UNHAPPY PARENTS WHO HAVE BEEN ON THE WRONG SIDE OF THESE RULINGS, THAT'S HOW LONG YOU'VE BEEN EXPERIENCING IT?
A	ANYONE WHO TRIES TO INTERVENE WITH THE PATHOLOGY WILL BE ATTACKED BY BOTH THE PATHOLOGY AND ITS ALLIES.
Q	OKAY. NOW, WHEN YOU EXPLAINED ABOUT THE PATHOLOGY, YOU

USED A NUMBER OF TERMS THAT SOUNDED LIKE THEY HAD A LEVEL OF SOPHISTICATION. CAN YOU BREAK IT DOWN FOR US IN LAYPERSON'S TERMS. AND IT MAY SEEM OBVIOUS TO YOU, AND IT'S PROBABLY OBVIOUS TO THE REST OF IT, BUT I WANT TO - I WANT TO GET THE TESTIMONY ON IT. WHAT IS GOING ON IN TERMS OF THIS DYNAMIC? IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT IS MOTIVATING THESE PARENTS WHO HAVE BEEN -- FOUND TO HAVE BEEN ABUSIVE AND THEIR ALLIES? WHAT -- WHAT'S GOING ON THERE?

A THE ONLY --

MS. [REDACTED]: OBJECTION. CALLS FOR SPECULATION.

THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

Q I'LL REPHRASE. WHEN YOU MADE YOUR DESCRIPTION EARLIER - FOR WHICH THERE WAS NO OBJECTION, FOR WHICH THE EVIDENCE IS IN -- CAN YOU EXPLAIN THAT IN LAYMAN'S TERMS WHAT THE DYNAMIC IS? WHAT IS GOING ON WITH THESE PARENTS WHO HAVE BEEN FOUND TO BE ABUSERS AND THEY'RE ALLIES IN TERMS OF THEIR ACTION WITH REGARDS TO YOUR REPUTATION?

MS. [REDACTED]: OBJECTION. COMPOUND. I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT THE QUESTION IS.

THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

MR. [REDACTED]: YOUR HONOR, HE DESCRIBED THEIR MOTIVATIONS AND THEIR ACTION. I JUST WANT TO - AND HE USED SOME TERMINOLOGY THAT I THINK WOULD BE DIFFICULT FOR NON-PROFESSIONALS --

THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND -- IN WHAT HIS ANSWER IS. MR. [REDACTED], BUT THE QUESTION IS CONFUSING.

Q MR. [REDACTED]: ALL RIGHT. SO COULD YOU JUST EXPLAIN YOUR ANSWER -- IF I MAY, YOUR HONOR -- CAN YOU JUST EXPLAIN YOUR ANSWER IN LAYMAN'S TERMS?

MS. [REDACTED]: OBJECTION. VAGUE AS TO "YOUR ANSWER. "I DON'T KNOW WHAT HE'S ASKING TO BE

THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

Q MR. [REDACTED]: OKAY. DR. CHILDRESS, YOU EARLIER DESCRIBED A DYNAMIC THAT WAS A RESPONSE BY PARENTS OF CHILDREN WHO HAD

BEEN FOUND TO BE ABUSERS AND A RESPONSE BY THEIR ALLIES WHO ARE SELF-APPOINTED PROTECTORS OF CHILDREN. YOU USED A NUMBER OF TERMS THAT SOUNDED LIKE THEY HAD PSYCHOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE, BUT MIGHT NOT BE EASILY INTERPRETABLE BY PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT LICENSED PSYCHOLOGIST, LIKE MYSELF, MS. [REDACTED] AND THE COURT. CAN YOU EXPLAIN WHAT IT IS THAT IS GOING ON WITH REGARDS TO THEIR RESPONSE TO YOUR WORK?

MS. [REDACTED]: OBJECTION. VAGUE STILL.

MR. [REDACTED]: YOUR HONOR, I HAVE TO RESPOND. HE GAVE A SPECIFIC ANSWER. I JUST WANT THAT ANSWER CLARIFIED. ALL I DID WAS DIRECT HIM IN A NON-LEADING WAY TO THE ANSWER HE ALREADY GAVE. NOW, ANOTHER WAY TO DO IT, I SUPPOSE, IS FOR THE COURT -- I'M SORRY, THE COURT REPORTER TO READ BACK THE ANSWER, BUT THAT'S BEING TEDIOUS. AREN'T WE ALL UNDERSTANDING WHAT IT IS I'M ASKING ABOUT?

MS. [REDACTED]: I AM NOT UNDERSTANDING, AND I DON'T KNOW WHAT ANSWER YOU'RE REFERENCING.

THE COURT: OKAY. I DON'T KNOW WHAT ANSWER YOU'RE REFERENCING EITHER, MR. [REDACTED].

MR. [REDACTED]: ALL RIGHT. THAT HELPS. ALL RIGHT. THEN I WOULD ASK THE REPORTER TO READ BACK THREE QUESTIONS BACK FROM WHEN THE FIRST OBJECTION WAS SUSTAINED, AND I THINK WE'LL BE WHERE WE NEED TO.

THE COURT: I DON'T KNOW HOW -- I THINK THE COURT REPORTER NEEDS MORE DIRECTION THAN THAT YOU'RE REFERRING TO SPECIFIC ANSWER THAT HE GAVE I THINK WE SHOULD START WITH WHAT THE QUESTION WAS, AND THEN I THINK IF SHE CAN FIND THE QUESTION SHE CAN FIND THE ANSWER THAT WAS GIVEN TO THAT QUESTION.

MR. [REDACTED]: ALL RIGHT. SO THE QUESTION WAS IN RESPONSE TO MY ASKING HOW LONG IT HAD GONE ON. SO THE KEY WORDS FOR SEARCHING AND WE'RE USING THAT TOOL WOULD BE, HOW LONG.

THE COURT: LET'S GO -- WE'LL JUST GO BACK TO THE LAST QUESTION. WE'LL START THERE, AND IF THAT'S NOT THE QUESTION, THEN WE'LL GO TO THE ONE RIGHT BEFORE BECAUSE IT WASN'T THAT MANY QUESTIONS AGO.

(DISCUSSION BETWEEN THE REPORTER AND THE COURT.)

THE COURT: NO. THIS IS THE QUESTION YOU ASKED DURING YOUR REDIRECT WHICH WAS A FEW QUESTIONS AGO. THE COURT REPORTER THOUGHT WE WERE TALKING ABOUT THE CROSS-EXAMINATION QUESTION. SO I THINK WE'VE CLEARED THAT UP.

(RECORD READ.)

THE COURT: THAT WAS THE QUESTION. AND NOW CAN YOU READ BACK HIS ANSWER, PLEASE.

(RECORD READ.)

THE COURT: DID -- DID YOU HEAR THE ANSWER? DR. CHILDRESS, DID YOU HEAR YOUR ANSWER THERE?

A YES, I DID.

Q OKAY. WITH REGARDS TO THE PATHOLOGY, ARE WE TALKING ABOUT A PATHOLOGY THAT INVOLVED THESE PARENTS WHO WERE FOUND TO BE ABUSERS FROM WHOM PROTECTIVE SEPARATION WAS ORDERED?

A YES.

Q OKAY. AND WHAT IS IT THAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THERE? WHAT -- CAN YOU EXPLAIN THAT IN TERMS THAT WILL HELP US UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING?

A SO THE PATHOLOGY IS A TRAUMA PATHOLOGY, AND IT WAS CAUSED BY TRAUMA IN THE CHILDHOOD OF A PARENT OR IN THE CHILDHOOD OF THE ALLIES. AND WHAT HAPPENS, AS I REFERENCED IN MY -- MY EARLIER ANSWER, IS TRAUMA DISTORTS PERCEPTIONS. AND SO WHEN YOU HAVE A TRAUMA THAT'S UNRESOLVED, A RELATIONSHIP TRAUMA, LIKE AN ATTACHMENT PATHOLOGY, PEOPLE'S PERCEPTIONS OF EVENTS AND RELATIONSHIPS AND SITUATIONS BECOMES DISTORTED. AND WHEN THAT DISTORTION BECOMES LARGE ENOUGH, IT BECOMES WHAT'S CALLED A THOUGHT DISORDER. NOW THEIR THINKING HAS BEEN DISRUPTED, AND THEY DO NOT -- NO LONGER PROCESSING INFORMATION LIKE THE REST OF US DO BECAUSE THE DISTORTIONS DUE TO THE UNRESOLVED TRAUMA, AND THEY'RE ALTERING THINGS SORT OF, THEIR THINKING AND PERCEPTION. AND WHEN IT GETS LARGE ENOUGH IT CALLED A DELUSION. THAT'S A FIXED AND FALSE BELIEF THAT'S MAINTAINED DESPITE CONTRARY EVIDENCE. THE TYPE OF DELUSION THAT WE'RE WORRIED ABOUT IS CALLED A PERSECUTORY DELUSION. IT'S A FALSE BELIEF IN BEING VICTIMIZED. AND THE DEFINITION OF THAT BY THE AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION IS THAT THE PERSON OR SOMEONE TO WHOM THE PERSON IS CLOSE IS BEING MALEVOLENTLY

TREATED IN SOME WAY. SO THAT'S THE PATHOLOGY THAT IT IS, THAT IT'S A FALSE BELIEF IN PERSECUTION, THAT THEY'RE BEING MALEVOLENTLY TREATED OR SOMEONE TO WHOM THEY'RE CLOSE IS BEING MALEVOLENTLY TREATED. AND SO THAT CAPTIVATES BOTH THE PRIMARY CASE IT'S CALLED -- IN THIS CASE IT WOULD BE THE PARENT -- AND AS WELL AS THE SECONDARY CASES OF A SHARED DELUSION THAT SURROUNDS IT WHO -- WHO ARE REENACTING THEIR OWN FALSE ISSUES BY JOINING IN THIS FALSE BELIEF.

Q OKAY. AND THIS SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES YOU JUST DESCRIBED, THAT APPLIES TO PARENTS FOR WHOM ABUSE HAS BEEN FOUND AND FOR WHICH -- AND FOR WHOM A PROTECTIVE SEPARATION WAS ORDERED AGAINST THEM FOR SOME PERIOD OF TIME WITH REGARDS TO THE CHILDREN. IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE SAYING?

A CORRECT.

Q OKAY. AND THESE PARENTS FIND EACH OTHER AND ORGANIZE IN SOME WAY?

A THEY -- THE ONES THAT ARE MOTIVATED TO INTRUDE INTO THE SITUATION WILL SEEK OUT THE PARENTS, SO THERE'S A -- DIFFICULTY SURROUNDING MY WORK AND MS. PRUTER'S IS THAT THEY WILL INTERVENE IN COURT CASES AND AFTER THE COURT CASE, THEY WILL SEEK OUT THE OTHER PARENT AND THEN SEEK TO GENERATE INFORMATION, AND -- AND SO THERE'S A WHOLE LITTLE NETWORK OF THIS -- THIS GROUP.

Q OKAY. SO ALLIES OF PARENTS OF THE SORT YOU'VE JUST DESCRIBED, WILL ACTUALLY APPEAR IN THE COURT?

A THEY WON'T APPEAR IN COURT. WHAT THEY'LL DO IS, AFTER THE COURT TRIAL, THEY WILL CONTACT THE PARENTS, THE ABUSIVE PARENT. SOMETIMES THEY WILL TRY TO CONTACT THE CHILD. SOMETIMES THEY WILL TRY TO INTRUDE INTO THE PROTECTIVE SEPARATION PERIOD. THERE'S BEEN LARGE NATIONAL MEDIA CASES MS. PRUTER'S BEEN INVOLVED IN, WHERE THEY WILL GO TO EXTRAORDINARY LENGTHS TO BREACH THE PROTECTIVE -- COURT-ORDERED PROTECTED SEPARATION AND TO COLLUDE WITH THE OTHER PARENT IN THE CONTACT. SO IT'S A FAIRLY EXTENSIVE NETWORK OF SUPPORT OF ALLIES FOR THIS PARTICULAR PATHOLOGY.

OKAY. NOW, I APOLOGIZE, BUT I DID NOT GO BACK AND FORTH WITH MY MUTE BUTTON. HOW WAS THE FOUND ON THAT, MS. [REDACTED] AND YOUR HONOR?



THE COURT: IT'S FINE. THERE DOESN'T SEEM TO BE ANY ISSUES RIGHT NOW.

ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.

Q SO WITH REGARDS TO THE TERMINOLOGY "PARENTAL ALIENATION," YOU HAVE INDICATED, BOTH ON MY EXAMINATION AND MS. [REDACTED]'S EXAMINATION, THAT YOU DISFAVOR IT, THAT THEY USE IT. CAN YOU EXPLAIN THAT.

A IT IS THE WORST CONSTRUCT FOR PATHOLOGY I HAVE EVER RUN ACROSS. I WISH THEY WOULD STOP USING IT. I ADVOCATE THAT WE STOP USING IT, BUT PEOPLE DON'T STOP USING IT. AND SO I HAVE TO USE THE TERM BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT OTHER PEOPLE'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE PATHOLOGY IS. I ALWAYS PUT TO THE TERM IN QUOTES TO INDICATE THAT IT'S NOT A REAL PATHOLOGY. I'M BASICALLY USING IT JUST FOR OTHER PEOPLE'S BENEFIT.

Q OKAY. SO IF IT'S NOT A REAL PATHOLOGY, WHAT IS IT THAT YOU'RE USING THE TERM "PARENTAL ALIENATION" TO DESCRIBE THAT IS REAL?

A WHAT I JUST DESCRIBED ABOUT THE TRAUMA, THAT THE PARENT HAS UNRESOLVED TRAUMA THAT'S DISTORTING THEIR THOUGHTS AND PERCEPTIONS, AND THEN THEY'RE IMPOSING THAT DISTORTION OF THOUGHT AND PERCEPTIONS ONTO THE CHILD, CREATING A SHARED DELUSION, A SHARED THOUGHT DISORDER, AND THAT'S AN ICD 10 DIAGNOSIS OF F-24, THE SHARED DELUSIONAL DISORDER, AND SO THAT'S THE ACTUAL PATHOLOGY. AND THEN THERE'S LARGER ISSUES AROUND THE ATTACHMENT SYSTEM AND PERSONALITY DISORDER THAT EXTEND OUT AS WE UNDERSTAND THE PATHOLOGY, BUT THAT'S ESSENTIALLY WHAT IT IS. IT'S A SHARED PERSECUTORY DELUSION BETWEEN THE CHILD AND THE PARENT, WHERE IT BREACHES THE CHILD'S ATTACHMENT BOUND TO THE OTHER PARENT.

Q MS. [REDACTED] ASKED YOU A NUMBER OF TIMES REGARDING YOUR THEORY WITH REGARDS TO DISRUPTION OF PARENTAL ATTACHMENT, AND YOU RESPONDED AND SAID, YOU DON'T HAVE YOUR OWN THEORY, THAT YOU DON'T CREATE KNOWLEDGE, YOU APPLY IT. CAN YOU EXPLAIN WHAT YOU MEAN BY NOT CREATING KNOWLEDGE BUT APPLYING.

A IN PSYCHOLOGY WE HAVE ROLES THAT - THE CREATORS OF KNOWLEDGE ARE THE RESEACHERS, SO THEY GET DOCTORATE DEGREES IN RESEARCH, NOT CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY. THEY DON'T DO THE ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT NOT THE RESEARCHERS AT THE

UNIVERSITIES. THEY ARE FOCUSED ON THE RESEARCH AND THE DIFFERENT FIELDS, SO THEY'RE GENERATING THE RESEARCH. NOW, THERE'S ANOTHER GROUP OF PSYCHOLOGISTS, LIKE MYSELF, WHO ARE THE CLINICAL PEOPLE. NOW, WE GO ON A CLINICAL TRACK. WE GET LICENSED. THAT INVOLVES A LOT OF SUPERVISION OF CLINICAL WORK. SO WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH A COUPLE OF YEARS OF SUPERVISED CLINICAL WORK, WHICH THE OTHER PH.D.S DON'T DO BECAUSE WE'RE WORKING IN THE FIELD WITH THE PATHOLOGY. SO AS OUR RESPONSIBILITY AS A CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGIST WE'RE NOT OUT THERE DOING RESEARCH. WE'RE OUT THERE APPLYING THE KNOWLEDGE OR -- THAT OTHER PSYCHOLOGISTS DISCOVER TO THE ACTUAL PRACTICAL APPLICATION. SO I DON'T HAVE A THEORY. WHAT I DO IS, I GO AND I TAKE THE KNOWLEDGE THAT IS ESTABLISHED AND I APPLY IT, AND SO THAT'S -- THAT'S WHAT I MEAN BY THAT.

Q THANK YOU. ALL RIGHT. WITH REGARDS TO THE PETITION TO THE APA, WHAT WAS THAT ABOUT?

A THE PARENTS ARE NOT RECEIVING APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT AND DIAGNOSTIC AND TREATMENT SERVICES OUT OF THE FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY FIELD BECAUSE OF CERTAIN VIOLATIONS OF ETHICAL CODE STANDARDS, 2.04 REGARDING THE APPLICATION OF KNOWLEDGE, 2.01 REGARDING THE KNOWLEDGE ITSELF OF ACQUIRING IT, 9.01 REGARDING APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT, THEN 3.04 REGARDING HARM TO THE PATIENTS, AS WELL AS FAILIURE IN THE DUTY TO PROTECT THE CHILD FROM PSYCHOLOGICAL CHILD ABUSE, AND TO PROTECT THE PARENT FROM IPV SPOUSAL ABUSE. SO I WROTE A PETITION, POSTED IT UP ONLINE AND 20,000 PARENTS SIGNED IT REQUESTING THAT THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION REVIEW THESE ETHICAL COMPLAINTS AND WITH CERTAIN REMEDIES. WE ASKED THAT THEY PRODUCE A PRESS RELEASE THAT SUPPORTED STANDARD 2.01 REQUIRING PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE, THE SECOND WAS WE ASKED THAT THEY REMOVE OR REVISE THEIR STATEMENT OF PARENTAL ALIENATION, SINCE THERE'S A SECOND ALTERNATIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE PATHOLOGY, AND WE ASKED THAT THEY HOLD A CONFERENCE OF EXPERTS IN ATTACHMENT, CHILD DEVELOPMENT, ETHICS, PSYCHOMETRICS, AND CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY, TO REVIEW ASSESSMENT PRACTICES IN COURT-INVOLVED CONFLICT, AND THEN TO LOOK AT ANOTHER CONFERENCE REGARDING ATTACHMENT PATHOLOGY SURROUNDING HIGH-CONFLICT DIVORCES.

Q ALL RIGHT. AND TO WHOM -- I UNDERSTAND IT WAS SUBMITTED TO THE APA, BUT WHAT DOES THAT MEAN? TO WHOM WAS IT ACTUALLY SUBMITTED?

A I ASKED TWO PARENT ADVOCATES ONE OF WHOM HAD LOST A CHILD BY THE -- MOTHER KILLED THE CHILD IN SUICIDE, SO THE OTHER WAS A PARENT ADVOCATE INVOLVED IN THE COMMUNITY. I ASKED THEM TO JOIN ME. AND WE WENT BACK TO WASHINGTON DC, HELD A PRESS CONFERENCE AND MET WITH SOME REPRESENTATIVES BACK THERE, AND THEN WE HAND DELIVERED THE PETITION TO THE APA IN THEIR EXECUTIVE OFFICES IN WASHINGTON.

Q AND IT SOUNDS LIKE THERE WAS A PRETTY DRAMATIC MOTIVATION FOR THIS PARTICULAR PETITION. WHAT IS IT THAT -- WHAT WAS IT THAT MOTIVATED THIS PETITION AT THAT TIME WITH THESE PEOPLE? AND I HEARD A MOTHER AND A CHILD BEING LOST. WHAT HAPPENED?

A IT WAS JUST A BROAD SCALE IN THIS PATHOLOGY. I HAVE STANDARDS ABOUT ETHICAL CODE STANDARDS 1.04 AND 1.05 THAT REQUIRE ME -- 'CAUSE ETHICAL STANDARDS ARE REQUIRED IN PSYCHOLOGY, THAT REQUIRE ME TO TAKE CERTAIN STEPS WHEN I BECOME AWARE OF UNETHICAL PRACTICES BY MY COLLEAGUES. 1.04 SAYS I HAVE TO TAKE INFORMAL STEPS TO NOTIFY THEM. 1.05 SAYS IF THAT'S NOT APPROPRIATE OR HANDLED APPROPRIATELY I HAVE TO TAKE ADDITIONAL STEPS, AND THEN IT OFFERS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LIKE CONTACTING ORGANIZATIONS. BUT RELATIVE TO ME, MY ETHICAL CONCERNS OVER HERE, UNDER STANDARD 1.05 IT WAS MY OBLIGATION TO NOTIFY THE APA OF MY CONCERNS AND THAT IT WAS NOT BEING PROPERLY ADDRESSED.

Q SO IT SOUNDS LIKE A PROFESSIONAL IN YOUR FIELD FAILED TO DO SOMETHING SPECIFIC. IS THAT WHAT HAPPENED?

A MANY PROFESSIONALS IN -- IT'S NOT MY FIELD. I'M A CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGIST. THEY'RE FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGISTS, AND I HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT THE PRACTICES WITHIN FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY.

Q ALL RIGHT. NOW, ARE YOU ABLE TO SAY, IN BROAD TERMS, WHAT IT WAS THEY WERE DOING WRONG?

A ON STANDARD 2.04 IS THE PRIMARY ISSUE WHICH REQUIRES AS THE -- THE TITLE OF IT IS, BASES FOR SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENTS, AND SO THAT'S WHAT IT COVERS. AND IT REQUIRES THAT PSYCHOLOGISTS USE AS A BASES FOR THEIR JUDGMENTS THE QUOTE "ESTABLISHED SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE DISCIPLINE," THAT WOULD BE ATTACHMENT, FAMILY SYSTEMS THERAPY, PERSONALITY DISORDERS, COMPLEX TRAUMA, CHILD DEVELOPMENT, SELF PSYCHOLOGY AND THE

	DIAGNOSTIC SYSTEMS, WHICH HAPPENS TO BE THE ICD-10 AND DSM-5. AND INSTEAD, WHAT THEY'RE APPLYING ARE THINGS LIKE THIS CONSTRUCT PARENTAL ALIENATION, OR THEY'RE COMING UP THIS NEW THING WHICH THEY JUST TOTALLY MAKE UP RESIST AND REFUSE AND IN LIEU OF APPLYING THE OTHER KNOWLEDGE. SO THEY DON'T APPLY THE KNOWLEDGE AND THEN THEY MAKE UP OTHER PATHOLOGIES AND THEN IT BEGINS TO RIPPLE OUT FROM THERE, BUT IT'S A PROBLEMATIC PRACTICE BECAUSE OF THAT.
Q	ARE WE TALKING ABOUT CHILD CUSTODY EVALUATIONS?
A	YES.
Q	OKAY. AND THEN YOU SAID ANOTHER CONFLICT CALLED RESISTENCE, WHAT? I DIDN'T HEAR THAT PART?
A	RESIST AND REFUSE OR REFUSE AND RESIST, I'M NOT POSITIVE. IT COULD -- THEY MAY HAVE SOME NEW WORDS, BUT IT'S NOT ANYTHING I'VE BOTHERED TO LOOK AT.
Q	OKAY. THEY ARE -- WERE THEY DESCRIBING OBSERVABLE BEHAVIORS? IN OTHER WORDS, A CHILD WHO MIGHT BE REJECTING OR RESISTING ANOTHER PARENT?
A	YES.
Q	OKAY. AND THAT WAS NOT YOUR OBJECTION THEN ADDRESSING OBSERVABLE THINGS, AS I UNDERSTAND IT?
A	THEY IDENTIFY THE SYMPTOMS. THEY DO NOT IDENTIFY THE PATHOLOGY OR THE DIAGNOSIS BECAUSE THEY FAIL TO APPLY ANY KNOWLEDGE, AND INSTEAD THEY MAKE UP STUFF AND WIND UP MAKING OPINIONS THAT ARE NOT ACTUALLY VALID.
Q	OKAY. SO IS THIS PETITION TO BRING FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGISTS, INCLUDING CHILD CUSTODY EVALUATORS INTO LINE WITH ESTABLISHED PROFESSIONAL UNDERSTANDING?
A	THAT WOULD BE THE INTENT, YES.
Q	OKAY. IT WAS NOT TO INTRODUCE SOME NEW THEORY OR SOMETHING THAT WAS NOT ESTABLISHED?
A	NO, THAT IS CORRECT.
Q	OKAY. AND IT'S BEEN A COUPLE OF YEARS, HAS THERE BEEN ANY FOLLOW-UP WITH REGARDS TO THE PRESENTATION OF THIS

PETITION TO WHICH YOU INDICATED THERE HAD BEEN NO RESPONSE?

A YES. INITIALLY WE WERE TOLD IT WAS GOING TO BE REFERRED TO A WORKING GROUP THAT HAD BEEN PREVIOUSLY SET UP FOR A PETITION BY PARENTS THE PREVIOUS, I THINK TWO YEARS AGO, REQUESTING SIMILAR SORTS OF THINGS, AND THEY SET UP A WORKING GROUP OF FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGISTS AT THAT TIME. AND SO THEY REFERRED THE SECOND ENTIRELY DIFFERENT PETITION TO THE SAME WORKING GROUP OF FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGISTS WHO HAVE RECENTLY PUT OUT PROPOSED CUSTODY EVALUATION GUIDELINES, BUT THEY DID NOT ADDRESS ANY OF ISSUES RELATIVE TO THE PETITION.

MS. [REDACTED]: EXCUSE ME. I WAS HAVING A HARD TIME --

THE REPORTER: ME TOO --

MS. [REDACTED]: -- UNDERSTANDING DR. CHILDRESS. I DON'T WANT TO INTERRUPT HIM. BUT I THINK, MR. [REDACTED], I SAW YOU TURNED OFF YOUR MICROPHONE, BUT I STILL, AFTER THAT, WAS HAVING A HARD TIME UNDERSTANDING HIM.

MR. [REDACTED]: I NOTED THE SAME. THAT'S WHY I TURNED OFF MY MICROPHONE, BUT IT MADE NO DIFFERENCE. THERE WAS A BUZZ ACCOMPANYING HIS TESTIMONY WHICH MADE IT DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND. AND I WILL AGREE WITH MS. [REDACTED], I DID NOT HEAR ALL OF IT.

COURT DR. CHILDRESS CAN YOU PLEASE REPEAT YOUR ANSWER

WITNESS: ZCAN I HEAR THE QUESTION AGAIN?

THE COURT: SURE, NO PROBLEM. IF THE REPORTER COULD READ IT BACK, THAT WOULD BE EASIER I THINK.

(RECORD READ.)

A I RECALL IT I THINK. WE WERE TOLD OR THE PARENTS WERE TOLD I HAVE NOT HAD CONTACT WITH THEM. THE PARENTS WERE

MS. [REDACTED]: OBJECTION HEARSAY.

THE COURT: SUSTAINED.

Q SO WE'RE NOT GETTING INTO WHETHER OR NOT YOU BELIEVE WHAT THE PARENTS SAID. WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT

	FOLLOW UP HAS OCCURRED WITH REGARDS TO THE PETITION? ACTUALLY, STRIKE THAT. LET ME ASK THIS MORE NARROW QUESTION FIRST. HAVE YOU TAKEN ANY FOLLOW-UP STEPS WITH REGARDS TO THE PETITION SINCE 2018?
A	NOT YET.
Q	OKAY. AND WAS THERE A REASON WHY YOU HAD NOT TAKEN ANY FOLLOW-UP STEPS?
A	ALOWING TIME TO THE APA SO THEY CAN RESPOND APPROPRIATELY.
Q	ALL RIGHT. AND ARE THERE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT SUGGEST TO YOU THAT THE APA MIGHT NEED ADDITIONAL TIME IN ORDER TO DO SO? IN OTHER WORDS, IS SOMETHING GOING ON AT THIS INTERIM TIME?
A	NO.
Q	HOW MUCH TIME WERE YOU THINKING OF GIVING THEM?
A	THERE ARE OTHER FACTORS RELATED TO COVID. THE NEXT PHASE IS TO DEVELOP A SIMILAR PETITION TO ALL 50-STATE LICENSE BOARDS AND 50-STATE PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATIONS. AND SO COVID, AND I'VE RELOCATED FROM LOS ANGELES UP TO SEATTLE, SO I'M BUSY.
Q	OKAY. WITH REGARDS TO YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT THINGS HAVE HAPPENED SINCE THE PETITION HAS BEEN SUBMITTED, WHERE DOES THAT UNDERSTANDING COME FROM?
A	I ASKED ONE OF THE PARENTS TO CONTACT THE APA AND ASK THEM WHAT THEY HAVE DONE WITH IT, AS WELL AS WHEN WE HANDED IT OFF I WAS ASKED BY THE REPRESENTATIVE WHETHER I -- THEY WANTED TO -- I WANTED THEM TO SUBMIT IT TO THE ETHICS COMMITTEE OF THE APA, AND I SAID YES, I DID.
Q	OKAY. IS SOMEONE ELSE TAKING THE LEAD ON THIS PETITION RIGHT NOW BESIDES YOU?
A	I WOULD ALLOW THE PARENTS TO TAKE THE LEAD ON THAT, BUT THEY ARE -- THEY'RE FOCUSED ON DIFFERENT ISSUES. THEY'RE -- THEY'RE NOT LOOKING TO MOVE THE APA.
Q	OKAY. WHAT'S YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUES THAT THE PARENTS ARE FOCUSED ON?

A THEIR INDIVIDUAL CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND THE DIFFICULTIES WITH THE COURTS AND TRYING TO GET THE ASSESSMENTS AND DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENTS, AND RESTORE THEIR FAMILIES.

Q OKAY. MS. ██████████ ASKED YOU A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS THAT WAS -- THAT WERE PREFACED BY "PROFESSIONALLY ACCEPTED RESEARCH." IS THAT A PHRASE THAT MEANS SOMETHING TO YOU?

A NO.

Q WHEN YOU ANSWERED THE QUESTION, DID YOU ASCRIBE ANY MEANING TO THAT PHRASE?

A RESEARCH.

RECROSS EXAMINATION  
BY MS. ██████████

Q OKAY DR. CHILDRESS, I WANTED TO ASK YOU ABOUT THE PEOPLE THAT YOU CALLED "FLYING MONKEYS," WHO YOU STATED WANT TO DISCREDIT YOU. SO INITIALLY, IT WAS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT YOU WERE SAYING THAT THESE ARE PARENTS WHO ARE UPSET WITH YOU. DID I UNDERSTAND THAT CORRECTLY? ARE THESE PARENTS OR PEOPLE OTHER THAN PARENTS?

A PEOPLE OTHER THAN PARENTS. THEY HAVE ALIGNED WITH THE PARENTS. THEY FIND THE PARENTS. BUT THEY ARE FOLKS WHO HAVE SEPARATE AGENDAS WHO BELIEVE THAT IT'S THEIR RIGHTEOUS AGENDA TO PROTECT CHILDREN OR TO PROTECT THE WORLD.

Q OKAY. AND SO THESE ARE OTHER PROFESSIONALS, IS THAT CORRECT?

A OTHER PEOPLE. THEY CAN OCCASIONALLY BE PROFESSIONALS, TYPICALLY THEY'RE JUST OTHER RANDOM PEOPLE.

Q OKAY. SO THE ONLY NAME THAT YOU SPECIFICALLY BROUGHT UP WAS JEAN MERCER, AND YOU INDICATED TO US THAT SHE HAS HER DOCTORATE DEGREE IN PSYCHOLOGY, CORRECT?

A YES.

Q OKAY. AND MS. MERCER HAS ACTUALLY TESTIFIED AS -- AS AN EXPERT IN CASES IN WHICH YOU HAVE TESTIFIED AS AN EXPERT,

	CORRECT?
A	THAT'S CORRECT.
Q	AND ABOUT HOW MANY CASES IN WHICH YOU TESTIFIED AS AN EXPERT HAS SHE ALSO?
A	ONE THAT I'M AWARE.
Q	AND IN THAT CASE THAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT, YOU WERE SUGGESTING TO THE COURT THAT THERE SHOULD BE A PERIOD OF PROTECTIVE CUSTODY FROM SOMEONE IN WHICH YOU INDICATED THAT THERE WAS THE SAME ISSUE THAT IS GOING ON IN THIS CASE, CORRECT?
A	I DON'T DISCUSS MY OTHER CASES.
Q	WELL, YOU'VE BEEN ASKED A QUESTION REGARDING YOUR PREVIOUS TESTIMONY AND --
A	I'M GOING TO --
Q	-- SO YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE ANSWER THAT QUESTION.
A	I'M GOING TO HAVE TO CONSIDER CONFIDENTIALITY ISSUES RELATIVE TO THAT CASE --
Q	MR. ██████: YOUR HONOR, I APOLOGIZE.
A	THE WITNESS: -- THAT IS STILL THE QUESTION THAT YOU'RE ASKING BEFORE.
Q	MR. ██████: I KNOW THE WITNESS IS ANSWERING, BUT I HAVE TO INTERPOSE AN OBJECTION. UNLESS THE FOUNDATIONAL QUESTION WOULD BE WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS A PUBLIC OR CONFIDENTIAL PROCEEDING. IF IT WAS A CONFIDENTIAL PROCEEDING WE'RE NOT ENTITLED TO KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT IT. IF IT'S A PUBLIC PROCEEDING WE'RE ENTITLED AS TO KNOW EVERYTHING ABOUT IT.
	THE COURT: SO REALLY --
	MS. ██████: WELL, I KNOW WHERE IT'S A PUBLIC PROCEEDING SO I CAN ASK --
	THE COURT: HOLD ON.



	MS. [REDACTED]: -- DR. CHILDRESS THE QUESTION.
	THE COURT: WHAT IS YOUR OBJECTION? FOUNDATION, MS. [REDACTED]?
	MR. [REDACTED]: RIGHT. WE DON'T HAVE A FOUNDATION AS TO WHETHER HE CAN ANSWER ALL --
	THE COURT: OKAY.
	MR. [REDACTED]: -- BECAUSE WE DON'T KNOW IF IT'S A PUBLIC OR PRIVATE PROCEEDING
	THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
	MR. [REDACTED]: SO IF IT'S A PRIVATE PROCEEDING --
	THE COURT: OKAY. SUSTAINED AS TO FOUNDATION.
Q	DO YOU HAVE ANY REASON TO BELIEVE THAT THAT IS CONFIDENTIAL PROCEEDING?
A	I AM NOT FAMILIAR WITH WHAT THE COURT DOES IN THAT CASE, AND THEY SEAL CASES -- RECORDS TO PROTECT THE CHILD. I HAVE NO INFORMATION FOLLOWING MY CASES AND MY TESTIMONY, WHAT HAPPENS.
Q	OKAY. AND THIS CASE, WAS THIS A FAMILY LAW CASE WHERE THE COURT WAS ADDRESSING CUSTODY AND VISITATION BETWEEN TWO PARENTS?
A	YES, IT WAS.
Q	OKAY. AND SO YOU HAVE NO REASON TO BELIEVE THAT THERE WAS ANY ORDER SAYING THAT ANYTHING WAS CONFIDENTIAL; IS THAT CORRECT?
A	I'M NOT AWARE OF ANY -- THE COURT'S RESPONSE TO MY TESTIMONY RELATIVE TO THE PROTECTION OF THE CLIENTS IN THE MATTER.
Q	OKAY. DO YOU KNOW WHAT THE OUTCOME WAS IN THAT CASE, WHETHER OR NOT THE COURT DID ISSUE WHAT YOU RECOMMENDED?
A	I TYPICALLY DON'T FOLLOW THE OUTCOMES OF MY CASES UNLESS THERE'S SOMETHING RELEVANT TO ME.

Q OKAY. AND SO YOU INDICATED -- IF I UNDERSTOOD CORRECTLY, YOU INDICATED THAT DR. MERCER SUFFERS FROM A PATHOLOGY; IS THAT CORRECT? WAS THAT YOUR TESTIMONY?

A NO, THAT WAS NOT.

Q OKAY. BUT I THINK YOU SAID THAT THESE PEOPLE WHO SOUGHT TO DISCREDIT YOU SUFFER FROM A PATHOLOGY. IS THAT INACCURATE?

A I WAS DESCRIBING A GROUP OF PEOPLE. I WAS NOT DESCRIBING DR. MERCER SPECIFICALLY. I HAVE NOT ASSESSED OR DIAGNOSED DR. MERCER SPECIFICALLY. I'M TALKING ABOUT A GROUP OF PEOPLE, A CATEGORY OF PEOPLE AND DESCRIBING -- AND GIVING A CATEGORICAL DESCRIPTION TO THEM.

Q OKAY. AND IS THERE SOME WAY THAT YOU CAN DIAGNOSE A WHOLE GROUP OF PEOPLE IF YOU CANNOT EVEN DIAGNOSE JUST ONE PERSON WITHOUT DOING AN ANALYSIS?

A THERE'S A PICTURE OF A GENTLEMAN IN OUR CAPITOL WITH HORNS ON HIS HEAD, FACE PAINTED, AND A SPEAR. I SUSPECT THERE MIGHT BE SOME PATHOLOGY THERE, BUT I HAVEN'T ASSESSED HIM SO I CAN'T DO IT. SO WE CAN LOOK AT EXTERNAL INDICATORS AND THINGS AND REACH CONCLUSIONS THAT THERE ARE PROBLEMS. AND IN PSYCHOLOGY THE WORD FOR PROBLEMS IS PATHOLOGY. AND SO THERE'S INDICATIONS, BUT I CANNOT SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFY AN INDIVIDUAL UNLESS I HAVE ASSESSED AND DIAGNOSED THE INDIVIDUAL.

Q OKAY. SO YOU TESTIFIED THAT THIS GROUP SUFFERS FROM A PATHOLOGY, AND YOU SAID THAT MS. MERCER IS A PART OF THIS GROUP. DO YOU ADMIT THAT YOU -- IT WOULD BE INACCURATE TO SAY THAT YOU CAN ASSESS THAT MS. MERCER HAS SOME TYPE OF PATHOLOGY?

A THE PATHOLOGY OF CONCERN IS A SHARED DELUSION, AND SO IF YOU BELIEVE THE FALSE BELIEF, IF YOU BELIEVE THE DELUSION, YOU ARE PART OF THE SHARED DELUSION. AND SO WHEN THERE IS A LARGE SCALE OR WHEN THERE IS A FALSE BELIEF THAT IS BEING PERPETRATED, AND PEOPLE JOIN TO THAT, THEY ARE SHARING IN THE DELUSION. NOW, HAVE I ASSESSED THEM? NO. BUT THERE'S EVIDENCE, ONCE THE PATHOLOGY IS IDENTIFIED, IT'S A SHARED DELUSIONAL BELIEF. THE PEOPLE WHO BELIEVE THAT THEN BECOME PART OF THAT PATHOLOGY.

Q	AND WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE DR. MERCER'S DELUSIONAL BELIEF TO BE?
A	THE PATHOLOGY IS A PERSECUTORY BELIEF.IT'S A --
Q	OKAY.
A	-- A BELIEF IN VICTIMIZATION, AND SO --
Q	CAN YOU PLEASE STOP --
A	-- THAT WOULD A SHARED DELUSION. IT IS A SHARED DELUSION. A PATHOLOGY FOR EVERYBODY WOULD BE A SHARED DELUSION. DR. MERCER, I HAVE NOT ASSESSED.
Q	OKAY. SO IF YOU CAN PLEASE, DR. CHILDRESS, LISTEN TO THE QUESTION AND ANSWER THE QUESTION INSTEAD OF GOING OFF ON A TANGENT. SO YOU --
	MR. [REDACTED]: OBJECTION. I OBJECT IT'S ARGUMENTATIVE. THAT ANSWER SOUNDED EXACTLY ON POINT TO THE QUESTION.
	THE COURT: OKAY. OVERRULED.
	MS. [REDACTED]: IT WAS NOT.
	MR. [REDACTED]: I RENEW MY OBJECTION THAT IT'S ARGUMENTATIVE. AND SHE DOESN'T -- AND COUNSEL DOESN'T GET TO CHARACTERIZE THE RESPONSE. IT SOUNDED -- THE QUESTION AND THE ANSWER SOUNDED EXACTLY MATCHED. DID THE COURT FIND OTHERWISE?
	THE COURT: OVERRULED.
	MR. [REDACTED]: THANK YOU.
Q	SO, DR. CHILDRESS, WHEN I'VE ASKED YOU ABOUT DR. MERCER, AND YOUR -- AT LEAST IMPLICATION THAT SHE SUFFERS FROM A DELUSION -- YOU SA-- -- YOU STARTED TALKING ABOUT A SHARED DELUSION AND FIND THAT YOU THINK SHE HAS SOME TYPE OF SHARED DELUSION. SO WHAT I'M ASKING IS REGARDING DR. MERCER WHAT IS IT THAT YOU THINK IS THE SHARED DELUSION THAT SHE BELIEVES IN?
A	I HAVE NO OPINION ON DR. MERCER. I HAVE NOT ASSESSED DR. MERCER, AND SO I HAVE NO OPINION AS TO HER PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS.

Q	OKAY. BUT YOUR TESTIMONY WAS THAT YOU THINK THAT SHE SHARES IN SOME DELUSION. IS THAT DELUSION THAT YOUR THEORIES ARE PROBLEMATIC OR SOMETHING ELSE?
A	I DID NOT TESTIFY THAT SHE HAS A SHARED DELUSION. I TESTIFIED THE PATHOLOGY IS A SHARED DELUSION. I TESTIFIED THAT SHE IS PART OF THAT GROUP THAT IS ATTACKING ME. I HAVE NOT ASSESSED HER. I DO NOT KNOW HER PSYCHOPATHOLOGY, AND I'M NOT CHARACTERIZING HER AS HAVING A DELUSION. THE PATHOLOGY IS IT A SHARED DELUSION. THAT WOULD BE THE PATHOLOGY OF CONCERN IS A SHARED DELUSION, A SHARED PERSECUTORY DELUSIONS. I AM NOT CHARACTERIZING DR. MERCER.
Q	OKAY. WELL, I WAS ASKING YOU QUESTIONS ABOUT DR. MERCER, SO WHEN I'M ASKING YOU QUESTIONS ABOUT DR. MERCER, WHY DO YOU KEEP BRINGING UP SHARED DELUSION IF YOU DON'T HAVE -
A	BE- --
Q	-- ANY INFORMATION TO SUPPORT THE CONCLUSION -
A	-- BECAUSE --
Q	-- THAT SHARED DELUSION APPLIES TO HER?
A	-- BECAUSE MY ANSWER IS, I HAVE NO OPINION ON DR. MERCER, AND YOU KEEP ASKING ME QUESTIONS, SO I KEEP ANSWERING IN AN EFFORT TO PROVIDE YOU WITH THE INFORMATION YOU'RE SEEKING, WHICH IS OF CONCERN, THE PATHOLOGY OF CONCERN IS A SHARED DELUSION. BUT I CANNOT LINK THAT TO DR. MERCER, BECAUSE I HAVE NOT ASSESSED DR. MERCER, BUT YOU KEEP ASKING ME THE SAME QUESTIONS. SO MY -- AND MY ANSWER TO YOUR SPECIFIC QUESTION IS, I HAVE NO OPINION ON DR. MERCER. THE REASON I KEEP BRINGING IT UP, THE OTHER SHARED DELUSION IS BECAUSE YOU KEEP ASKING ME WHAT THE PATHOLOGY IS.
Q	OKAY. I'M JUST ASKING YOU --
A	AND SO I'M JUST ANSWERING YOU.
Q	YOU REFERENCED THAT THIS GROUP HAS A PATHOLOGY; IS THAT CORRECT?
A	THE WORD "PATHOLOGY" IN PSYCHOLOGY MEANS PROBLEM. SO, YES, THIS GROUP HAS A PROBLEM.

Q OKAY. AND WHAT IS THE PROBLEM THAT THIS GROUP HAS?

A A SHARED PERSECUTORY DELUSION -

Q AND IS THAT THE SAME -

A .-- LIKE QANON.

Q IS THAT -- SO THIS -- AND WHEN YOU SAY A GROUP HAS A PROBLEM, ARE -- HOW DO YOU APPLY THAT TO A GROUP? ARE YOU SAYING THAT EVERYBODY IN THE GROUP HAS IT OR THAT MORE THAN HALF OF THE GROUP HAS IT, OR THAT LEAST SOME PEOPLE IN THE GROUP HAVE IT? CAN YOU EXPLAIN HOW YOU APPLY -

A YES.

Q -- THAT TO A WHOLE GROUP?

A RIGHT. OKAY. SO WE HAVE THE GROUP LIKE QANON, WHO BELIEVES THAT DONALD TRUMP IS PROTECTING US FROM SATANIC PEDOPHILES. AND SO THAT'S A DELUSION. DONALD TRUMP IS NOT PROTECTING US FROM SATANIC PEDOPHILES. SO QANON IS A PERSECUTORY DELUSION, A BELIEF THAT THERE'S MALEVOLENT INTENTIONS, AND THAT HE'S PROTECTING US FROM THAT. SO THERE'S A GROUP OF PEOPLE WHO'VE SHARED THIS BELIEF THAT DONALD TRUMP IS PROTECTING US FROM SATANIC PEDOPHILES, SO THAT'S THE SHARED DELUSION. NOW, IF A PERSON BELIEVES THAT, THEY'RE PART OF THE SHARED DELUSION, BUT I CANNOT DIAGNOSE THE INDIVIDUAL PERSON UNTIL I TALK TO THE PERSON AND SAY, IS DONALD TRUMP PROTECTING US FROM SATANIC PEDOPHILES? THE MOMENT THEY SAY YES, THEN -- BUT I MEAN WE HAVE TO BELIEVE THAT DONALD TRUMP ISN'T PROTECTING US FROM SATANIC PEDOPHILES, BUT I THINK THAT'S THE GENERALLY RECOGNIZED ASSUMPTION. AND SO THAT'S THE SHARED DELUSION. SO IT'S NOT AN UNCOMMON PATHOLOGY. IT'S JUST NOT COMMONLY DIAGNOSED. AND SO YOU SEE IT IN A SOCIAL SURROUND AS A RESULT OF UNRESOLVED TRAUMA, AND SO THE PATHOLOGY -- AND IT'S ALSO ASSOCIATED WITH NARCISSISTIC PATHOLOGY, SO THAT "FLYING MONKEY" TERM IN THE URBAN DICTIONARY, IT'S ASSOCIATED WITH NARCISSISTIC PATHOLOGY, WHICH IS WHAT WE HAVE OVER IN THE COURT-INVOLVED FAMILY CONFLICT WHICH IS WHY THAT SOCIAL DISTRIBUTION FEATURE SHOWS UP HERE, AND, ALSO, BECAUSE THEY'RE VERY -- THEY'RE FIGHTING IN THE COURTS AND I'M A TESTIFYING EXPERT, SO THEY WANT TO DISCREDIT ME FOR FUTURE TESTIMONIES.

Q	OKAY. AND WHAT IS THE FALSE BELIEF THAT YOU THINK ALL -- THIS WHOLE GROUP SHARES?
A	THEY ARE CONCERNED ABOUT PEDOPHILIA AGAIN. IT'S A THEME OF THIS. AND SO THEY'RE CONCERNED ABOUT PEDOPHILIA, AND THEY'RE CONCERNED ABOUT RETURNING CHILDREN TO PEDOPHILES AND SO ANY ALLEGATION, EVEN THE DELUSIONAL, PERSECUTORY ALLEGATIONS OF THE PARENTS ARE BELIEVED AS TRUE.
Q	OKAY.
A	AND THEY REFUSE TO ACCEPT ANY OTHER ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATION OTHER THAN IT'S A PEDOPHILIA, AND SO I'M PROTECTING PEDOPHILIA AND WE'RE RETURNING KIDS TO PEDOPHILES.
Q	OKAY. AND WHAT LEADS YOU TO BELIEVE THAT? SO LET ME CLARIFY, SO THAT I MAKE SURE I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING. IS THE FALSE BELIEF THAT YOU ARE A PROTECTOR OF PEDOPHILIA OR THAT YOU ARE A PEDOPHILIAC?
A	IT BORDERS. SOMETIMES THE ALLEGATION IS THAT I'M PROTECTING OR HELPING RETURN KIDS TO PEDOPHILES, OTHER TIMES THERE'S THE IMPLICATION THERE I MIGHT BE A PEDOPHILE. YOU CAN SEE THAT WITH RICHARD GARDNER, WHO WAS ACCUSED OF PEDOPHILIA, THAT'S THE ALLEGATION THAT GETS THROWN AROUND A LOT HERE. YOU SEE IT WITH QANON, BECAUSE THAT'S THE NATURE OF THE PATHOLOGY OVER HERE.
Q	OKAY. AND HAVE YOU EVER HEARD DR. MERCER MAKE ANY STATEMENT THAT HER CONCERN WITH YOU IS RELATED TO YOU AND PEDOPHILIA.
A	NOT PEDOPHILIA. SHE THINKS I'M -- IT'S UNCLEAR WHAT SHE THINKS. SHE AND I EXCHANGED SOME BLOGS, AND IT'S UNCLEAR WHAT SHE THINKS.
Q	OKAY. AND I'M TALKING ABOUT HER, BECAUSE THAT IS THE ONLY NAME THAT -- THAT YOU BROUGHT UP AS PART OF THIS GROUP THAT SEEKS TO DISCREDIT YOU.
A	UH-HUH.
Q	SO IS THERE ANYTHING THAT SHE HAS EVER WRITTEN TO MAKE YOU BELIEVE THAT THE ISSUE THAT SHE HAS WITH YOUR WORK IS THAT YOU ARE SUPPORTING PEDOPHILES?
A	I DON'T READ WHAT SHE WRITES.

Q	YOU HAVE NOT READ ANYTHING SHE'S WRITTEN?
A	THERE WAS A PERIOD THAT I THINK I READ ONE OF HER BLOGS, AND THEN WE EXCHANGED LIKE THREE OR FOUR BLOGS BACK AND FORTH THAT I WAS RESPONDING TO HER QUESTIONS AND STUFF AND SHE NEVER RESPONDED TO MINE, AND, EVENTUALLY, IT WAS JUST POINTLESS AND SO I STOPPED COMMUNICATING TO HER. THERE'S -- SHE DOES NOT HAVE A LICENSE, SHE'S NEVER BEEN TRAINED IN PATHOLOGY, SHE'S NEVER DIAGNOSED ANYTHING, SO HER OPINIONS ARE ABSOLUTELY IRRELEVANT. SHE'S AN OLD -- SHE'S A HIGH SCHOOL -- COLLEGE TEACHER FROM 20 YEARS AGO WHO HAS AN OPINION
Q	OKAY. AND SO WHEN YOU DID READ WHAT SHE WROTE, BECAUSE YOU INDICATED THAT YOU WERE -- WHEN YOU SAID WE BLOG BACK AND FORTH, WHAT I'M ASSUMING BY THAT IS YOU READ HER BLOG POST AND YOU RESPONDED TO THEM; IS THAT CORRECT?
A	I FORGET HOW. SHE ASKED SOME QUESTIONS. IT COULD HAVE BEEN ON A BLOG, IT COULD HAVE BEEN THAT SHE BLOGGED ON MINE AND ASKED ME THE QUESTION. BUT I GOT HER QUESTIONS, AND I WROTE MY ANSWERS ON MY BLOG AND THEN WE EXCHANGED IT THAT WAY.
Q	OKAY. SO WHAT LEADS YOU TO BELIEVE THAT DR. JEAN MERCER IS ONE OF THE PRIMARY PEOPLE WHO SEEKS TO DISCREDIT YOU.
A	BECAUSE OF WHAT SHE SAID THERE, WHAT SHE SAID TO ME --
Q	WHAT DID --
A	-- THE FACT THAT SHE'S TESTIFIED IN --
Q	WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY --
A	-- HER TESTIMONY IN HER CASES, AND THEN --
Q	-- WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY WHAT SHE SAID THERE?
A	SHE'S ACCUSING ME OF JUST BEING SOME SORT OF UNREASONABLE PSYCHOLOGIST AND ATTACHMENT AND --
Q	OKAY. SO LET'S ME STOP --
A	SHE'S CONFUSED IN WHAT SHE SAYS, AND SO I DON'T ANSWER.
Q	STOP. YOU SAY THAT SHE IS ACCUSING YOU. WHERE IS IT THAT

A YES.

Q -- SHE IS MAKING THESE ACCUSATIONS?

A A LONG TIME AGO WITH SOME BLOGS, AND THEN WITH THE -- SHE ATTACKED THE AFCC PRESENTATION WE HAD, SHE WENT AFTER US WHEN WE PRESENTED TO THE APA, SHE WAS WRITING LETTERS TO THEM TRYING TO STOP US FROM PRESENTING THERE, SHE TESTIFIED IN COURT, AND SO I'VE READ HER TRANSCRIPTS OF HER TESTIMONY IN COURT WHERE SHE'S CRITICIZING THE DIAGNOSTIC AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS WHEN SHE NEVER ASSESSED OR DIAGNOSED ANYTHING. AND SO -- SO I -- I'VE SEEN HER TESTIMONY. LET'S PUT IT THAT WAY. THAT WAS ONE PLACE SHE CRITICIZED. AND SO SHE'S OUT THERE. AND SHE -- SHE CAME INTO CALIFORNIA. SHE'S NOT FROM CALIFORNIA, AND THAT'S ILLEGAL. THERE'S A LAW THAT SAYS YOU'RE NOT ALLOWED TO COME IN AND TESTIFY IF YOU'RE NOT LICENSED. SHE'S NOT LICENSED.

Q OKAY.

A AND SO THERE'S A WHOLE BUNCH OF THINGS.

Q OKAY. YOU'VE ANSWERED THE QUESTION. I HAVE A QUESTION, FOLLOW-UP QUESTION. SO I'VE BEEN TRYING TO UNDERSTAND WHAT IS WHAT HER HOW SHE IS ATTEMPTING TO DISCREDIT YOU OR WHAT HER COMPLAINTS AGAINST YOU ARE. AND I HEARD YOU SAY ONE THING IN YOUR ANSWER THAT I WANTED TO ASK YOU INTEREST. YOU SAID THAT IN HER TESTIMONY THAT YOU READ IN A TRIAL TRANSCRIPT THAT SHE CRITICIZED YOUR PROCESS; IS THAT CORRECT?

A SHE'S DISCUSSED ASSESSMENT AND DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT OF PATHOLOGY AND CAME UP WITH DIFFERENT OPINIONS THAN MINE, BUT SHE'S NEVER BEEN TRAINED TO ASSESS OR DIAGNOSE OR TREAT ANY PATHOLOGY, SO SHE'S PRACTICING BEYOND THE BOUNDARIES OF HER COMPETENCE, AND SO SHE TESTIFIES --

Q OKAY.

A -- ABOUT STUFF, BUT SHE DOESN'T KNOW WHAT SHE'S TALKING ABOUT.

Q BUT MY QUESTION IS, YOU SAID THAT THIS LADY, JEAN MERCER IS -- WAS THE PROMINENT PERSON IN A GROUP OF PEOPLE TRYING TO DISCREDIT YOU, AND SO --



A SHE WAS ONE PERSON.

Q -- WHAT I'M TRYING TO UNDERSTAND WHAT IS IT THAT THEY ARE COMPLAINING ABOUT?

A THE GROUP COMPLAINS ABOUT DIFFERENT STUFF. SO I'LL GIVE YOU PEDOPHILE. YOU GO TO MY FACEBOOK PAGE AND YOU'LL SEE REFERENCE TO PEDOPHILIA UP THERE ON ME, AND SO THEY ATTACK ON THE PEDOPHILIA. NOW, JEAN MERCER DOESN'T DO THAT, SHE GOES OFF TO ATTACHMENT SOMEHOW, BUT SHE'S NOT TRAINED IN ATTACHMENT SO SHE GETS KIND OF CONFUSED BY THE STUFF. BUT THE DESIGN IS TO ATTACK ME AND UNDERMINE MY CREDIBILITY. THAT'S THE PURPOSE. AND THE SPECIFIC ARGUMENTS ARE SECONDARY TO THE PURPOSE.

Q OKAY. NOW, PREVIOUSLY YOU HAD TESTIFIED THAT YOU DIDN'T KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT THE AFCC COMPLAINT OR WHY THE -- WHY THE CREDITS WERE REVOKED THAT THEY HAD INITIALLY GRANTED. BUT, WHEN YOU WERE TESTIFYING JUST A SECOND AGO, YOU STATED THAT ONE OF THE REASONS YOU FEEL THAT SHE IS TRYING TO DISCREDIT YOU IS THAT SHE COMPLAINS TO THE AFCC AND HAD YOUR CREDITS REVOKED. SO YOU ACTUALLY DO KNOW WHY YOUR AFCC CREDITS WERE REVOKED, DON'T YOU?

MR. [REDACTED]: SO OBJECTION --

THE WITNESS: IN THE FIRST --

MR. [REDACTED]: -- ARGUMENTATIVE. AND IT'S ALSO IT'S INCORRECTLY STATE WHAT WAS TESTIFIED. THERE WAS NO IN CONSISTENCY IN WHAT HE SAID ON DIRECT WITH HER OR ON CROSS WITH ME.

MS. [REDACTED]: HE'S NOT MY WITNESS.

MR. [REDACTED]: I'M SORRY, THAT'S TRUE.

THE COURT: OKAY. OVERRULED.

MR. [REDACTED]: I MISSPOKE IN TERMS OF WHAT KIND OF EXAMINATION. BUT, YES, HE DID INDICATE THAT HIS INFORMATION WAS LIMITED, HE INDICATED WHAT THE SOURCE WAS, BUT THERE'S NO IN CONSISTENCY. IT'S JUST ARGUMENTATIVE, AND IT ASSUMES A FACT NOT IN EVIDENCE.

THE COURT: OKAY. OVERRULED.

A THE FIRST ANSWER I GAVE WAS RELATIVE TO THE AFCC CONTACTING ME AND PROVIDING ME WITH AN EXPLANATION OF WHAT WAS HAPPENING. AND, NO, I HAVE HAD NO CONTACT OR NO EXPLANATION ABOUT WHAT THE SITUATION WAS OR IF ANYTHING OCCURRED. HOWEVER, SUBSEQUENT TO THAT, I HAVE HEARD REPORTS, CREDIBLE REPORTS I BELIEVE THAT THE CEU UNITS WERE REVOKED AND THAT JEAN MERCER WAS INVOLVED IN ADVOCATING FOR THE REVOCATION.

Q I'M SORRY, JUST BECAUSE OF THE AUDIO QUALITY, I DID NOT KNOW IF YOU SAID NOT CREDIBLE REPORTS OR CREDIBLE REPORTS.

A THEY'RE -- I FORGET THE CONTEXT OF THE SENTENCE.

Q YOU SAID THAT YOU HAD RECEIVED SOME TYPE OF REPORT CREDIBLE OR NOT --

A YES.

Q -- CREDIBLE --

A I HAVE REC--

Q -- WAS THAT JEAN MERCER WAS INVOLVED?

A I HAVE RECEIVED CREDIBLE REPORTS FROM OTHERS THAT JEAN MERCER WAS INVOLVED IN THE EFFORTS TO GET THE CEU UNITS REVOKED. I HAVE NOT BEEN INFORMED BY CEU -- BY THE AFCC THAT THEY HAVE BEEN REVOKED OR FOR ANY REASONS, AND SO I HAVE NOT HAD ANY FORMAL KNOWLEDGE ABOUT WHAT THE SITUATION WAS WHATSOEVER.

Q OKAY. AND THEN YOU WERE TALKING VERY QUICKLY, SO I DIDN'T CATCH ALL OF IT. BUT AFTER -- WHEN YOU WERE LISTING THINGS THAT YOU BELIEVE THAT JEAN MERCER HAD DONE, YOU SAID SHE CONTACTED THE AFCC, AND THEN YOU SAID SOMETHING ABOUT THE APA. WHAT -- WHAT WAS THE INCIDENT WITH THE APA THAT YOU WERE REFERENCING.

A I WAS PRESENTING A PAPER AGAIN WITH MS. PRUTER TO THE APA, AND THE -- THIS GROUP OF PEOPLE FOUND OUT THAT I WAS PRESENTING A PAPER WITH MS. PRUTER TO THE APA SO THEY CONTACTED THE APA WITH LETTERS. SO THE APA CONTACT THEY SAID, WE'RE GETTING A LOT OF COMPLAINTS ABOUT YOUR PRESENTATION? WHAT'S UP? AND I SAID I WORK IN COURT-INVOLVED PATHOLOGY, AND THEY SAID OKAY. AND SO THEY ASKED

	<p>THAT I SUBMIT THE PAPER AHEAD OF TIME FOR REVIEW. I DID. THEY PEER REVIEWED IT. THEY SAID IT'S FINE, AND I PRESENTED AT THE 19 - 2019 APA CONVENTION. THE HEAD OF DIVISION 24 WAS THERE AGAIN TO REVIEW, AND SHE SPOKE AFTERWARDS AND IT WAS FINE. BUT WE ASKED THAT ALL THE LETTERS THAT WERE ATTACKING US BE ARCHIVED WITH THE APA BECAUSE THIS IS A PATHOLOGY AND THAT'S A SYMPTOM FEATURE OF THE PATHOLOGY.</p>
Q	<p>OKAY. AND THIS GROUP THAT YOU'RE SAYING SEEKS TO DISCREDIT YOU, HOW MANY PEOPLE DO YOU THINK THAT THAT CONSIST OF?</p>
A	<p>I HAVE NO IDEA. AND THEY'RE PROBABLY VARIABLE IN TERMS OF THEIR CONSISTENCY. THEY'RE NOT REALLY A GROUP IT'S A -- A LOOSE ASSOCIATION OF PEOPLE.</p>
Q	<p>OKAY. AND I WANT TO GO BACK TO YOUR PETITION TO THE APA IN JUNE OF 2018.</p>
A	<p>OKAY.</p>
Q	<p>SO IN READING YOUR ARTICLE IT SEEMS THAT THE PRIMARY REQUEST WAS A CHANGE TO THE OFFICIAL APA POSITION STATEMENT ON PARENTAL ALIENATION; IS THAT CORRECT?</p>
A	<p>NO. THERE WERE THREE REMEDIES.</p>
Q	<p>OKAY. AND SO THAT IS ONE OF THREE REQUESTS, IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE SAYING?</p>
A	<p>THAT WAS ONE OF THREE REMEDIES WE REQUESTED, THAT WAS THE MIDDLE ONE.</p>
Q	<p>OKAY. SO THE FIRST -- WHAT WAS THE FIRST REMEDY?</p>
A	<p>TO RELEASE A PRESS STATEMENT SUPPORTING -- EXPRESSING THEIR SUPPORT FOR STANDARD 2.01 OF THE APA ETHICS CODES REGARDING BOUNDARIES OF COMPETENCE.</p>
Q	<p>OKAY. AND WHY WOULD THE APA EXPRESS THEIR SUPPORT FOR A STANDARD OF THEIR OWN CODE OF ETHICS.</p>
A	<p>TO HELP THE CHILDREN</p>
Q	<p>I MEAN THEY CREATED THAT ISN'T IT IMPLIED THAT THEY SUPPORT AN ETHICS CODE THAT THEY CREATED?</p>

A	AND THAT THERE'RE 20,000 PARENTS THAT WANT THAT TO BE EXPLICITLY STATED TO ALL OF FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY, THAT FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY NEEDS TO BE COMPETENT ACCORDING TO THE BOUNDARIES OF COMPETENCE 2.01, AND SO 20,000 PARENTS WANT THE APA TO TELL FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY THEY NEED TO BE COMPETENT. THAT'S REMEDY ONE.
Q	OKAY. SO THE FIRST THING WAS THAT YOU WANTED THE APA TO DO A PRESS RELEASE SAYING THAT THEY WANT FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGISTS TO FOLLOW THE ETHICS CODE; IS THAT CORRECT
A	NO.
Q	-- BASICALLY?
A	NO. WE WANT THEM TO RELEASE THAT THEY SUPPORT STANDARD 2.01 OF THE APA ETHICS CODE. THAT'S ALL WE WANT, IS JUST THAT THEY SUPPORT STANDARD 2.01. AND THEN WE CAN TAKE THAT TO THE FORENSIC PEOPLE AND SAY, PLEASE YOU NEED TO BE COMPETENT IN WHAT YOU DO, WHICH MEANS YOU NEED TO LOOK AT ATTACHMENT AND FAMILY SYSTEMS THERAPY, COMPLEX TRAUMA, CHILD DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE DIAGNOSTIC SYSTEMS.
Q	OKAY. AND THEN NUMBER TWO WAS YOUR REQUEST THAT THE APA CHANGE THEIR OFFICIAL POSITION ON PARENTAL ALIENATION, CORRECT?
A	CORRECT.
Q	OKAY. AND THEN REQUEST NUMBER 3 WAS THAT THEY CONVENE A CONFERENCE OF EXPERTS IN ATTACHMENT SYSTEM PERSONALITY DISORDER PATHOLOGY, FAMILY SYSTEMS THERAPY AND COMPLEX TRAUMA TO PRODUCE A WHITE PAPER ON ATTACHMENT-RISK RELATED PATHOLOGY SURROUNDING DIVORCE, IS THAT CORRECT?
A	CORRECT. CORRECT.
Q	OKAY. ON THIS WEB PAGE WHERE YOU LAY OUT YOUR IDEA FOR YOUR OPINION THAT THE APA IS COMPLICIT WITH CHILD ABUSE, YOU COUNT THE DAYS SINCE YOUR PETITION WAS PRESENTED AND THERE HAS SINCE BEEN NO RESPONSE; IS THAT CORRECT?
A	THAT'S CORRECT.
Q	SO THERE ON YOUR WEBSITE PAGE YOU INDICATE THAT EVERY DAY THAT THE APA DOES NOT DO AS YOU'VE REQUESTED THEY ARE BEING

	COMPLICIT WITH CHILD ABUSE; IS THAT RIGHT?
A	THAT'S CORRECT.
Q	AND SO THAT'S SOMETHING LIKE 955 DAYS AT THIS POINT, THAT YOU ALLEGED THAT BY NOT RESPONDING TO YOU THEY ARE BEING COMPLICIT WITH CHILD ABUSE?
A	BY NOT RESPONDING TO THE PETITION THAT 20,000 PARENTS ASKED ME TO FORWARD TO THE ETHICS CODES RELATIVE TO FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY, YES, THEY ARE BEING COMPLICIT WITH THE CHILD ABUSE THAT'S CURRENTLY OCCURRING.
Q	AND SO THE REASON THAT YOU'RE REQUESTING THE THINGS THAT YOU'RE REQUESTING IS BECAUSE AT THIS POINT, YOUR IDEAS ARE NOT GENERALLY ACCEPTED BY THE APA, CORRECT?
A	NO. IT'S BECAUSE THERE IS NO ETHICAL REVIEW CURRENTLY BEING CONDUCTED IN FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY BECAUSE THEY REVIEW THEMSELVES. THERE IS NO OUTSIDE INDEPENDENT REVIEW CURRENTLY BEING CONDUCTED OF THE ETHICAL ISSUES OR THE ETHICS IN FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY IN RESONSE TO THE PETITION THE APA. I HAVE NO THEORY. I HAVE NO IDEAS. THIS IS JOHN BOWLBY IN ATTACHMENT, THIS IS SALVADOR MINUCHIN IN FAMILY SYSTEMS THERAPY. AND SO MY IDEAS ARE NOT ACCEPTED OR REJECTED.
Q	OKAY. SO THEN EXPLAIN TO ME YOUR SECOND REQUEST WHERE YOU'RE ASKING THE APA TO CHANGE THEIR OFFICIAL POSITION REGARDING PARENTAL ALIENATION?
A	BECAUSE PARENTAL ALIENATION IS A HORRIBLE, HORRIBLE PATHOLOGY, AND IT SHOULD -- IT'S BENEATH THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS OF PRACTICES TO BE USED IN A PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY. HOWEVER, TRANSGENERATIONAL TRAUMA, PERSONALITY DISORDERS, ATTACHMENT PATHOLOGY, ARE ALL ACTUAL THINGS. AND SO RATHER THAN THE APA RESPONDING TO THIS MADE-UP PATHOLOGY OF PARENTAL ALIENATION, THEY NEED TO ISSUE A POSITION STATEMENT ON ACTUAL ATTACHMENT PATHOLOGY AND FAMILY CONFLICT PATHOLOGY GOING ON IN THE COURTS, WHICH WOULD BE THE THIRD REMEDY WHICH IS TO HOLD A CONFERENCE OF EXPERTS TO PRODUCE A WHITE PAPER ON SPECIFICALLY THAT EXACT ISSUE AND THAT WHITE PAPER COULD HELP THEM FORMULATE THE POSITION STATEMENT RELATIVE TO THESE HIGH-INTENSITY FAMILY CONFLICTS AND DIVORCE.

MR. [REDACTED]: I APOLOGIZE FOR INTERJECTING, BUT I NOTE THAT IT'S 3:30 AND I KNOW THE PARTIES WERE HOPING TO --
THE COURT: OKAY.
MR. [REDACTED]: -- TAKE THE CHILD BY 4:00.
THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.
MR. [REDACTED]: WHAT IS MS. [REDACTED] PREDICTION WITH REGARDS TO QUESTIONING?
THE COURT: ALL RIGHT SO --
MS. [REDACTED]: I ANTICIPATE THAT IT WILL PROBABLY BE ABOUT 15 MINUTES TO HALF AN HOUR.
THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. SO WHY DON'T WE GO AHEAD AND WE'LL RECESS FOR THE DAY. I BELIEVE WE'RE BACK ON THE 19TH.
TESTIMONY RESUMES  TRANSCRIPT RESUMES WITH REDIRECT BY MR. [REDACTED]:
Q MR. [REDACTED]: HOW DOES ONE TREAT ONGOING SYMPTOMS OF ABUSE? BEFORE YOU ANSWER THAT, MS. [REDACTED] -- IN RESPONSE TO MS. [REDACTED]'S QUESTIONS SHE ASKED HOW LONG, BUT I DON'T THINK SHE ASKED WHAT IT LOOKED LIKE. AND I THINK YOUR ANSWER TO HOW LONG WAS SIX MONTHS TO DEAL WITH THE MAJOR ISSUES AND THEN FOR AN IMPROVEMENT AND THEN OVERALL 18 TO 24 MONTHS, IS THAT WHAT YOU SAID?
A GENERALLY, YES.
Q OKAY. SO WHAT IS DONE DURING THOSE MONTHS UP TO TWO YEARS?
A IT WOULD DEPEND ON THE TYPE OF ABUSE. THERE ARE FOUR CHILD ABUSE DIAGNOSES: PHYSICAL, SEXUAL, NEGLECT, AND PSYCHOLOGICAL. ALL OF THOSE ARE EQUIVALENT IN THE SEVERITY OF THE DAMAGE THEY DO, BUT THEY DIFFER IN THE TYPE OF DAMAGE. AND SO THE TREATMENT FOR EACH CATEGORY WOULD BE DIFFERENT, RELATIVE TO WHAT THE ABUSE WAS.
Q OKAY. HAVE YOU EVER SEEN A PROTECTIVE ORDER FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE INVOLVING FALSE ALLEGATIONS OF PHYSICAL

	OR SEXUAL ABUSE?
A	YES.
Q	HAVE YOU EVER SEEN A PROTECTIVE ORDER FOR RECOVERY OF THE CHILD THAT INCLUDED A PROGRAM SUCH AS THE HIGH ROADS PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY DORCY PRUTER?
A	YES, I HAVE
Q	IN WHAT CONTEXT HAVE YOU SEEN THOSE KIND OF ORDERS?
A	I -- I'M AWARE OF THOSE ORDERS WITH THE FAMILIES SHE WORKS WITH. SHE HAS ALSO REFERRED A FAMILY AFTER HER WORKSHOP TO ME FOR THE FOLLOW-UP CARE, AND I SAW THE ORDERS UNDER THAT CIRCUMSTANCE AND WORKED WITH THE PATIENT CARE FOLLOWING THE WORKSHOP.
Q	OKAY. AND HAVE YOU BEEN INVOLVED IN SUCCESSFUL RECOVERY OF THE CHILD? AND WHAT I MEAN IS, COMPLETE, NOT ONLY IS THE RELATIONSHIP RESTORED WITH THE TARGETED PARENTS, BUT, ALSO, THE PARENT WHO HAD CREATED THE ISSUE HAD BEEN ASSISTED SUFFICIENTLY THAT THE CHILD WAS ABLE TO BENEFIT FROM A GOOD RELATIONSHIP WITH BOTH PARENTS?
A	PERSONALLY INVOLVED TO A LIMITED EXTENT, BECAUSE THE PATHOLOGICAL PARENTS HAVE CONTINUED TO REQUIRE SOME DEGREE OF STABILIZATION AND MONITORING.
Q	OKAY. AND SO WHAT DOES THAT LOOK LIKE?
A	SOMETIMES IT REQUIRES RESTRICTIONS ON THEIR ABILITY TO TEXT THE OTHER CHILD DURING -- WHEN ON VISITATIONS WITH THE OTHER PARENT. BUT, FOR THE MOST PART, WE WANT TO DEVELOP RESILIENCE IN THE CHILD SO THAT THE CHILD DOES NOT BECOME UNSTABLE RELATIVE TO THE PARENT'S PARENTING, BECAUSE THAT'S GOING TO BE MOM OR DAD FOR THE REST OF CHILD'S LIFE. SO ULTIMATELY OUR GOAL IS TO STABILIZE THE CHILD'S RECOVERY INDEPENDENT OF THE MORE FRAGILE PARENT'S PARENTING.
Q	MS. ██████████ WAS ASKING IF YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF ABUSE POTENTIALLY FROM THE MOTHER WAS A PERSONAL THEORY OF YOURS SO THAT -- AND SHE ACTUALLY ASKED MORE THAN ONE THING ABOUT IT, BUT LET'S START -- LET'S BREAK IT DOWN BY ELEMENT. SO, FIRST OF ALL, IS THIS A PERSONAL THEORY OF YOURS ON WHICH YOU'VE BEEN OPERATING AND TESTIFYING FOR THE LAST NUMBER OF

	DAYS IN THIS COURT?
A	NO.
Q	OKAY. WHAT IS THE SOURCE OF -- OTHER THAN THE ONE ARTICLE THAT YOU PRESENTED, WHAT IS -- AND YOUR EXPERIENCE, WHAT IS THE SOURCE OF THIS UNDERSTANDING OF THE DYNAMIC AS ITS APPLICABLE TO THIS CASE? WHERE DOES THAT COME FROM IF IT'S NOT YOURS?
A	WELL, PARTLY IT COMES FROM THE DSM-5 AND ICD DIAGNOSTIC SYSTEMS, PARTLY IT COMES FROM FAMILY SYSTEMS THERAPY, CROSS-GENERATIONAL COALITION, EMOTIONAL CUTOFF, PARTLY IT COMES FROM THE ATTACHMENT LITERATURE, REGARDING BREACHES IN THE ATTACHMENT BONDS, CHILD DEVELOPMENT ON BREACH AND REPAIR SEQUENCE, PERSONALITY DISORDERS ON THE RESULT OF UNRESOLVED TRAUMA IN THE ADULT, COMPLEX TRAUMA, CHILDREN'S EXPRESSION OF COMPLEX TRAUMA.
Q	AND ARE THERE CONTRARY MODELS GENERALLY ACCEPTED BY PEOPLE IN YOUR PROFESSION?
A	REGARDING?
Q	THE SYSTEMS THAT YOU JUST ARTICULATED. IN OTHER WORDS, YOU HAVE A -- YOU HAVE BEEN GIVING YOUR OPINION WHICH MS. [REDACTED] ASKED IF THAT WAS YOUR THEORY, YOU REPEATEDLY SAID NO, YOU JUST INDICATED THE SOURCE. I'M ASKING IS THERE -- IS THERE ANY CONTROVERSY OR DEBATE REGARDING THE SOURCES OF YOUR OPINION?
A	NO.
Q	MS. [REDACTED] ASKED YOU IF THE APA HAD TAKEN A POSITION CONTRARY TO OPINIONS THAT YOU HAVE EXPRESSED BASED ON THE SOURCES YOU'VE ARTICULATED. HAVE THE APA DONE SO?
A	NO.
Q	HAVE THE APA TAKEN A POSITION RELATED TO THE CONCEPT OF ALIENATION OR WHATEVER ELSE IT MIGHT BE CALLED, IN OTHER WORDS, THE CONCEPT OF ONE PARENT DISRUPTING THE ATTACHMENT BETWEEN THE CHILD AND THE OTHER PARENT?
A	YES.



Q	AND WHEN DID THE APA TAKE THAT POSITION?
A	I BELIEVE IT WAS 2007.
Q	ALL RIGHT. AND WHAT POSITION DID THE APA TAKE IN 2007?
A	THAT THEY TEND TO TAKE NO POSITION ON ANYTHING, BUT THEY HAD CONCERNS OR THAT THERE WAS A PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION THAT THEY APPOINTED THAT HAD CONCERNS ABOUT THE USE OF THE CONSTRUCT OF PARENTAL ALIENATION AND THAT IT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED CAUTIOUSLY IF USED IN PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE.
Q	OKAY. SO WHAT DOES THAT MEAN TO YOU? WHAT DOES THAT MEAN THAT THEY'VE TAKEN THAT POSITION?
A	THAT THE CONSTRUCT OF PARENTAL ALIENATION IS NOT A SUPPORTED CONSTRUCT.
Q	OKAY. HAS ANYONE, TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, OR HAS THERE BEEN ANY GROUP, THAT HAS INTERPRETED THAT TO MEAN THAT DISRUPTION OF AN ATTACHMENT BETWEEN A PARENT AND CHILD BY THE OTHER PARENT DOES NOT OCCUR?
A	THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO ASSERT THAT.
Q	AND IS THAT A MISINTERPRETATION OF THE APA POSITION OR A CORRECT INTERPRETATION OF THE APA POSITION?
A	MIXED. THE APA SAYS THE CONSTRUCT OF PARENTAL ALIENATION IS NOT ADEQUATE. THAT IS AN ACCURATE AND CORRECT STATEMENT. THE IDEA THAT THE PATHOLOGY DOES NOT EXIST IS INACCURATE.
Q	IS THE APA'S POSITION THAT THE PATHOLOGY DOES NOT EXIST AT ALL OR THAT IT IS NOT INDEPENDENTLY DEFINED FROM EXISTING PATHOLOGIES IN DSM-5 -- AND I'M SORRY --WHAT'S THE OTHER SOURCE -- THE DIAGNOSTIC SOURCE WHAT LIKE -- I DON'T REMEMBER IT RIGHT THIS SECOND.
A	THE APA TAKES NO POSITION WHATSOEVER ON THAT, AND THAT IS REMEDY THREE OF THE PETITION ASKING FOR GREATER CLARITY FROM THEM.
Q	DO YOU HAVE ANY UNDERSTANDING AS TO WHAT CAUSED THE APA TO TAKE ANY POSITION AT ALL ON THE ISSUE OF ALIENATION?
A	TO SOME DEGREE.

Q	AND WHERE DOES THAT UNDERSTANDING COME FROM?
A	THE -- THEIR RESPONSE TO THE PETITION TO THE
Q	OKAY. AND WHAT WAS THAT RESPONSE?
A	THEY PROVIDED -- THEY GAVE IT TO A WORKING GROUP OF FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGISTS AND HAVE PROVIDED NO RESPONSE IN TWO YEARS.
Q	AND WHAT DOES THAT TELL YOU?
A	THAT THE APA IS NOT ADDRESSING THE ISSUE.
Q	OKAY. AND WHAT DOES THAT TELL YOU ABOUT WHAT MOTIVATED THE APA TO TAKE ANY POSITION AT ALL IN 2007?
A	I CAN'T SPEAK TO THEIR MOTIVATION BACK THEN, OTHER THAN THAT WAS A PERIOD OF HIGH-INTENSITY CONFLICT AROUND THE CONSTRUCT OF PARENTAL ALIENATION.
Q	WHAT WAS GOING ON AT THAT TIME THAT WOULD WAS OF HIGH-INTENSITY CONFLICT?
A	IN THE PROPOSAL OF THAT, RICHARD GARDNER HAD MADE SOME INAPPROPRIATE STATEMENTS ABOUT SEX ABUSE AND WHAT THE TREATMENT OF SEX ABUSE OR THE DISREGARD OF SEX ABUSE ALLEGATIONS THAT HAD STIRRED UP CONSIDERABLE CONTROVERSY, AND SO THERE WAS AN EFFORT TO UNDERSTAND WHETHER OR NOT THIS PARENTAL ALIENATION CONSTRUCT WAS ADEQUATE AND ACCURATE.
Q	OKAY. SO WHAT WAS GARDNER TRYING TO ADVANCE?
A	HE PROPOSED THAT THERE WAS A PATHOLOGY THAT INVOLVES ONE PARENT'S MANIPULATION AND INTRUSION INTO THE CHILD'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE OTHER PARENT AND THAT'S WHAT HE PROPOSED, BUT HE DIDN'T PROCEED MUCH BEYOND THAT.
Q	OKAY. AND DO YOU AGREE WITH DR. GARDNER?
A	I AGREE THERE'S A PATHOLOGY. I DISAGREE ABOUT EVERYTHING AFTER THAT.
Q	OKAY. AND WHAT IS THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN YOUR POSITIONS?
A	DR. GARDNER, A PSYCHIATRIST SKIPPED THE STEP OF DIAGNOSIS, AND THAT'S NOT PROFESSIONAL. SO RATHER THAN APPLYING THE

CONSTRUCTS OF PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY SUCH AS ATTACHMENT, FAMILY SYSTEMS THERAPY, WHICH REQUIRE AN APPROPRIATE APPROACH, HE EXCUSED HIMSELF FROM THAT STANDARD OF PRACTICE AND SIMPLY PROPOSED A NEW FORM OF PATHOLOGY THAT HE HAD DISCOVERED, THIS PARENTAL ALIENATION SYNDROME. AND IN DOING THAT HE TOOK EVERYBODY OFF THE PATH OF PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS OF PRACTICE AND GOT US INTO DECADES OF ENDLESS CONTROVERSY AND CONFLICT.

Q SO IN TERMS OF THE APA'S POSITION THAT PARENTAL ALIENATION SYNDROME, AS A STAND-ALONE PATHOLOGY, YOU -- IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU AGREE WITH THAT, THAT IT'S NOT A STAND-ALONE PATHOLOGY?

A THAT IS CORRECT.

Q IF IT BE NOT A STAND-ALONE PATHOLOGY, AND IF THE TERM IS NOT ADVISED THAT WE USE, WHAT IS IT THAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR WHEN ONE PARENT INTERFERES WITH THE ATTACHMENT BETWEEN A CHILD AND THE OTHER PARENT?

A A THOUGHT DISORDER, SPECIFICALLY A PERSECUTORY DELUSION IN THE PARENT THAT IS BEING IMPOSED ON THE CHILD SO THAT THERE'S A FALSE BELIEF IN VICTIMIZATION. THE MOMENT THE CHILD ADOPTS THE VICTIMIZED -- THE FALSE VICTIMIZED CHILD ROLE, THAT AUTOMATICALLY IMPOSES THE ABUSIVE ROLE ONTO THE NORMAL-RANGE-TARGETED PARENT AND ALLOWS THE PATHOLOGICAL ALLIED PARENT TO ADOPT AND ASSUME THE ROLE OF THE SUPPOSEDLY PROTECTIVE PARENT, THEREBY REENACTING THE TRAUMA OF THE SUPPOSEDLY ABUSIVE CHILD OR VICTIMIZED CHILD, ABUSIVE PARENT/PROTECTIVE PARENT.

Q NOW, WE'VE HAD A NUMBER OF CPS WORKERS ON THE STAND, AND THEY HAVE TALKED ABOUT THE POTENTIAL FOR INTERFERENCE WITH THE ATTACHMENT BETWEEN PARENT AND CHILD AND WITH THAT BEING EMOTIONAL ABUSE, BUT THEY DID NOT SEEM TO THINK THAT IT WAS ALWAYS BASED ON A MISTAKE, THAT SOMETIMES IT WAS BASED ON DESIGN. SO MY QUESTION TO YOU IS, IS THAT A PARADIGM THAT IS DISTINCT FROM THE ONE YOU JUST GAVE? IN OTHER WORDS, DO WE SOMETIMES HAVE PARENTS WHO DON'T HAVE THOUGHT DISORDER OF THE KIND YOU HAVE DESCRIBED, BUT HAVE OTHER MOTIVATIONS TO TRY TO INTERFERE WITH THE BONDING BETWEEN THE OTHER PARENTS AND THE CHILD?

A IF THERE IS INTENTIONAL INTENT TO CREATE THE PATHOLOGY IN THE CHILD, THEN THE DIAGNOSIS SHIFTS TO A FACTITIOUS

DISORDER IMPOSED ON ANOTHER, COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS MUNCHAUSEN BY PROXY. SO THE PARENT IS IMPOSING A PSYCHOLOGICAL OR PSYCHIATRIC DISORDER OR MEDICAL DISORDER ON TO THE CHILD FOR SECONDARY GAIN AND SO IF THERE'S PURPOSEFUL INTENT, THEN WE WOULD SHIFT OVER TO THE FACTITIOUS DISORDER DIAGNOSIS.

Q OKAY. AND DOES THAT ALSO FALL INTO WHAT GARDNER TRIED TO DESCRIBE AS STAND ALONE PATHOLOGY, PARENTAL ALIENATION SYNDROME?

A IT WOULD BE WITHIN THE SCOPE OF DIAGNOSES THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED.

Q OKAY. WHAT IS THE BEST WAY TO SUMMARIZE TO LAY PEOPLE HOW IT IS POSSIBLE THAT, YES, PARENTS INTERFERE WITH THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ONE PARENT AND A CHILD, SOMETHING THAT FAMILY ATTORNEYS IN COURT SEE ALL THE TIME, BUT HOW DO WE EXPLAIN, THAT, YES, THAT OCCURS, BUT NO IT'S NOT A SYNDROME CALLED PARENTAL ALIENATION SYNDROME BUT RATHER SOMETHING ELSE THAT IS RECOGNIZED BY THE APA? HOW DO YOU WE EXPLAIN THAT?

A FIRST EVERYBODY -- I WOULD RECOMMEND EVERYBODY STOP USING THE CONSTRUCT IN PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE. LAY PEOPLE, THE GENERAL PUBLIC CAN USE THE TERM AS A GENERAL DESCRIPTION, BUT ALL MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS NEED TO STOP USING THAT CONSTRUCT AND TO START USING PROFESSIONALLY GROUNDED CONSTRUCTS. I WOULD RECOMMEND FAMILY SYSTEMS THERAPY AS A BASIC ORGANIZATION, IN WHICH CASE WE'RE LOOKING AT THE CROSS-GENERATIONAL COALITION OF THE CHILD WITH ONE PARENT AGAINST THE OTHER PARENT, RESULTING IN AN EMOTIONAL CUT OFF IN THE CHILD'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE TARGETED PARENT. THOSE BOTH ARE WELL DEFINED CONSTRUCTS WITHIN FAMILY SYSTEMS THERAPY THAT HAVE A NUMBER OF ASSOCIATED SYMPTOMS. SO THAT WOULD BE MY FIRST RECOMMENDATION, IS WE GROUND THERE, AND THEN GROUND IN THE DIAGNOSTIC SYSTEMS RELATIVE TO WE NEED A TREATMENT PLAN. THAT'S WHAT WE NEED, A TREATMENT PLAN. IT'S NOT A CUSTODY SITUATION, FOR TREATMENT WE NEED A DIAGNOSIS. AND SO THAT'S WHERE WE TURN TO THE GROUNDED MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS TO GET A DIAGNOSIS THAT COULD GUIDE OUR TREATMENT.

Q WITH REGARDS TO -- STRIKE THAT. TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, ARE THERE ANY SERIOUS PSYCHOLOGISTS OR GROUPS OF PSYCHOLOGISTS THAT DO NOT -- OR THAT ADVANCE THE PROPOSITION THAT PARENTS

	NEVER INTERFERE WITH THE ATTACHMENT BETWEEN THE OTHER PARENT AND THE CHILD.
A	I'M NOT AWARE OF SUCH A POSITION.
Q	OKAY. ARE THERE ANY SERIOUS PSYCHOLOGISTS, THAT YOU'RE AWARE, THAT ADVANCE THE POSITION THAT PARENTS NEVER MAKE FALSE ALLEGATIONS OF CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE FOR THE PURPOSE OF INTERFERING WITH THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE OTHER PARENT AND A CHILD, THAT IT DOES NOT OCCUR?
A	I'M NOT AWARE OF THAT POSITION AMONG SERIOUS PROFESSIONALS.
Q	OKAY. WITH REGARDS TO THE APA'S POSITION REGARDING PARENTAL ALIENATION SYNDROME, I ASKED YOU EARLIER IF AN ELEMENT OF THAT POSITION WAS THAT IT DID NOT OCCUR, AND I THOUGHT YOU SAID YES. SO IN TERMS OF WHAT DID NOT OCCUR WHAT IS IT ABOUT THE APA'S POSITION THAT IS BEING INDICATED DOES THAT OCCUR?
A	THEIR ARGUMENT AGAINST THAT ONE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL ARGUMENTS IS THAT THERE'S NO EMPIRICAL RESEARCH TO SUPPORT IT. IF THERE'S NO RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR IT THEN THE PATHOLOGY DOES NOT EXIST, AND SO IT'S ESSENTIALLY MAKING STUFF UP. AND IT'S EASY -- THAT PARTICULAR MADE UP THING, PARENTAL ALIENATION SYNDROME, IS ATROCIOUS IN TERMS OF THE DIAGNOSTIC MODEL. AND SO THAT DOES NOT EXIST, SO PEOPLE WHO SAY OR ARGUE THAT THE PATHOLOGY DOES NOT EXIT WHEN THEY USE THAT CONSTRUCT ARE ACCURATE. HOWEVER, YOU ALSO FIND OTHER KNOWLEDGE ABSOLUTELY FOR DESCRIBING IT, AND SO IT DEPENDS ON WHAT THE POSITION IS OF THE PEOPLE MAKING THE ARGUMENT.
Q	OKAY. ALL RIGHT. SO NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT THE PETITION THERE WERE THREE THINGS THAT THE PETITION CALLED FOR, SO LET'S START WITH THE FIRST ONE. WHAT WAS THE FIRST THING -- BY THE WAY, DID YOU DRAFT THE PETITION OR DID SOMEONE ELSE?
A	I DID.
Q	YOU DID DRAFT THE PETITION. AND HOW IS IT THAT IT FELL TO YOU TO DRAFT THE PETITION?
A	STANDARD 1.05 OF THE APA ETHICS CODE. THE ISSUES WERE NOT BEING APPROPRIATELY ADDRESSED. SO WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE RECOMMENDED REMEDIES OF STANDARD 1.05, I FOLLOWED UP WITH THE PETITION TO THE APA.

Q	OKAY. AND WHAT'S THE FIRST THING THAT YOU ASKED FOR?
A	AN IMMEDIATE PRESS RELEASE STATING THEIR SUPPORT FOR STANDARD 2.01 OF THE APA ETHICS CODE.
Q	ALL RIGHT. NOW, MS. ██████████ ASKED WHY THERE WOULD BE ANY BENEFIT THAT THE APA INDICATED SUPPORT FOR A STANDARD THAT APPLIES TO ALL ITS MEMBERS, SO I DON'T -- I'M NOT SURE I UNDERSTOOD THE ANSWER THAT YOU GAVE MS. ██████████, PERHAPS I CAN GIVE YOU ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN. WHY IS IT HELPFUL FOR APA TO EXPRESS ITS SUPPORT FOR ITS OWN STANDARD?
A	BECAUSE RIGHT NOW THERE IS, IN MY OPINION, RAMPANT AND UNCHECKED VIOLATION OF THAT STANDARD, AND I BELIEVE THAT THE APA MAKING THAT STATEMENT WOULD BE ENOUGH FOR THE PARENTS TO THEN GO BACK TO THE MENTAL HEALTH PEOPLE TO EMPHASIZE THEIR OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE STANDARD 2.01.
Q	NOW, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT YOU SAID THAT CHILD CUSTODY EVALUATORS WERE DOING WRONG IS, THEY WERE COMING UP WITH OTHER WAYS OF CHARACTERIZING PARENTAL ALIENATION SYNDROME. THEY WERE GIVING IT OTHER NAMES, BUT THEY WERE STILL USING IT. DID I UNDERSTAND THAT CORRECTLY?
A	YES.
Q	OKAY. SO IN THAT REGARD, IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU WERE TAKING A STANCE AGAINST THAT PRACTICE, IS THAT RIGHT?
A	YES.
Q	OKAY. AND -- ALL RIGHT. LET ME MOVE ON FROM THERE. SO THE SECOND REMEDY THAT YOU WERE SEEKING WAS WHAT?
A	THE CHANGE IN THE OFFICIAL POSITION STATEMENT OF THE APA REGARDING PARENTAL ALIENATION SYNDROME.
Q	ALL RIGHT. AND DID YOU ADVANCE WHAT YOU THOUGHT THE POSITION SHOULD BE?
A	YES.
Q	AND WHAT DID YOU INDICATE THE POSITION SHOULD BE?
A	THAT THERE IS ALTERNATIVE DESCRIPTIONS OF THE PATHOLOGY

THAT NEEDS TO BE CONSIDERED AND APPLIED. AND THAT THIS PARTICULAR POPULATION REPRESENTS WHAT'S CALLED A VULNERABLE POPULATION THAT REQUIRES OR SPECIAL POPULATION THAT REQUIRES SPECIAL PROTECTION SUCH AS PRISON POPULATIONS THAT HAVE A COMPROMISED AUTONOMY, CAPACITY FOR INFORMED CONSENT AND DECISION MAKING. AND SO SPECIAL PROTECTIONS ARE NEEDED RELATIVE TO THE SPECIAL POPULATION IN COURT INVOLVED FAMILY CONFLICT.

Q ISN'T THERE A DANGER IF THE APA ADOPTS YOUR POSITION -- AND LET ME EXPLAIN WHAT I MEAN BY THAT QUESTION. IF THE APA'S CURRENT POSITION, WHICH IS THAT IT, YOU KNOW, DOES NOT FIND MERIT WITH PARENTAL ALIENATION SYNDROME AS A STAND ALONE INDEPENDENT PATHOLOGY THAT HAS NOT BEEN SUPPORTED BY RESEARCH, RIGHT, THAT'S THE APA'S POSITION, AS I UNDERSTAND IT?

A YES.

Q AND YOU'VE ALREADY INDICATED, MORE THAN ONCE IN YOUR TESTIMONY, THAT CHILD CUSTODY EVALUATORS HAVE SIMPLY GONE AROUND THAT POSITION BY SAYING, WE'LL JUST CALL IT BY A DIFFERENT NAME. IS THERE NOT A DANGER WITH YOUR REMEDY NUMBER 2 THAT YOU ACTUALLY GIVE SUPPORT TO THE VERY FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGISTS THAT YOU'RE CONCERNED ABOUT?

A PERHAPS.

Q OKAY. IN THAT CASE WHY SHOULD WE DO IT?

A THAT'S WHAT REMEDY THREE IS DESIGNED TO ADDRESS.

Q OKAY. SO NOW WE'LL GET TO REMEDY 3, SO WHAT IS REMEDY 3?

A THAT THE APA CONVENE A CONFERENCE OF EXPERTS IN ATTACHMENT, FAMILY SYSTEMS THERAPY AND THE RELEVANT OTHER DOMAINS, CHILD DEVELOPMENT, CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY, NOT FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY, TO PRODUCE A WHITE PAPER ON THE ISSUES OF ATTACHMENT AND FAMILY CONFLICT IN THE FAMILY COURTS, AND THEN POTENTIALLY FOLLOWED UP BY A SECOND CONFERENCE INVOLVING ETHICS, PSYCHOMETRICS, CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY, AND RELEVANT DOMAINS, REGARDING THE ROLE OF PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY IN THE FAMILY COURTS. AND THEN BASED ON THIS -- THESE REVIEWS, THEN THE SECOND QUESTION ABOUT THE POSITION STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION COULD BE CLARIFIED.

Q	WHAT'S A WHITE PAPER?
A	IT'S A STATEMENT OF SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS POTENTIALLY WITH THE DISAGREEMENTS OF A FORMAL CONFERENCE.
Q	HAS THE APA DONE THAT IN OTHER AREAS BEFORE?
A	YES.
Q	WHAT'S AN EXAMPLE?
A	CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY. I'VE BEEN -- IN THE 1980S AND '90S AND THERE'S A POSITION STATEMENT RIGHT NOW ABOUT CULTURAL PSYCHOLOGY AND OUR OBLIGATIONS RELATIVE TO THAT.
Q	IS THAT THE MOST CONVENIENT LAST TIME THAT HAS OCCURRED?
A	THERE WAS A PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ABOUT THE ALIENATION SYNDROME, BUT THAT WAS LIMITED SCOPE TO THAT PARTICULAR DIAGNOSIS.
Q	WHEN WAS THAT?
A	I -- 1990S I THINK. THEY MAY HAVE HELD SIMILAR CONFERENCES ABOUT SOME, YOU KNOW, LIKE THE BORDER WALL OR THE SEPARATION OF CHILDREN FROM THE BORDER THING. THE SCOPE OF THEM EXPANDS AND/OR CONTRACTS BASED ON THE ISSUES INVOLVED.
Q	IS THERE A CONNECTION BETWEEN POLITICS - IN THE LEGAL STATED SENSE OF THE WORDS? IN OTHER WORDS, WITH THE INTEREST OF ELECTED OFFICIALS IN POWER, IS THERE A CONNECTION BETWEEN AGENDA'S THERE AND ISSUES THAT THE APA TAKEN UP?
A	NOT THAT I'M AWARE OF.
Q	OKAY. SO WHEN YOU TALKED ABOUT THINGS LIKE THE BORDER WALL AND THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION WITH REGARDS TO ALIENATION, THAT WAS WHAT GENERATED THE QUESTION, WHICH WAS WHETHER OR NOT THESE ARE OFTEN INITIATED FROM A POLITICAL LEVEL. BUT YOU SAID NOT THAT YOU'RE AWARE OF SO IS THAT COINCIDENTAL?
A	IT'S SOCIAL. IT'S NOT POLITICAL. IT'S SOCIAL. SO WHEN WE HAVE CHILDREN BEING SEPARATED FROM PARENTS AT THE BORDER, THAT BECOMES A SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL ISSUE THAT WOULD TRIGGER AN OPINION STATEMENT FROM APA. THE ISSUES OF --



	POLITICAL ISSUES ARE NOT RELEVANT. IF THERE'S SOMETHING GOING ON SUCH AS CULTURAL BIASES THEN THAT WARRANTS A CONFERENCE. AND SO THERE'S VARIOUS -- THE TRIGGERS ARE PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL.
Q	ALL RIGHT. IS THERE A REASON WHY THE ISSUES THAT YOU'RE CONCERNED ABOUT IS NOT ADDRESSED MORE SIMPLY? IN OTHER WORDS, CHILD CUSTODY EVALUATOR GENERATES A REPORT, THE REPORT DOES NOT USE ACCEPTED APPROACHES WITH REGARDS TO DIAGNOSING CIRCUMSTANCE, IN OTHER WORDS, THEY USE PARENTAL ALIENATION SYNDROME BUT BY A DIFFERENT NAME, RIGHT? AND THEN WE JUST LODGE A COMPLAINT WITH THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BOARD AND SAY THESE PEOPLE ARE NOT ACTING WITHIN THE STANDARDS OF PRACTICE, AND THEY'RE NOT ACTING PURSUANT TO THE STANDARD, WHICH IS THAT THEY USE ACCEPTED RESEARCH OR OBSERVE FACTS IN ORDER TO REACH THEIR CONCLUSIONS. WHY NOT JUST MAKE A COMPLAINT?
A	PARENTS ARE MAKING COMPLAINTS TO THE LICENSING BOARDS.
Q	ALL RIGHT. AND IS THERE A REASON WHY THAT ISN'T AN EFFECTIVE WAY TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT?
A	LICENSING BOARDS ARE NOT OPENING INVESTIGATIONS.
Q	AND DO YOU KNOW WHY NOT?
A	BECAUSE THIS IS CONSIDERED A DOMAIN OF FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY, SO ALL COMPLAINTS GOING TO THE LICENSING BOARDS ABOUT FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGISTS ARE GIVEN TO OTHER FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGISTS FOR REVIEW, AND NO CASES ARE BEING OPENED.
Q	SO I'M MISSING A LOGICAL STEP THERE. WHY IT IS THAT CASES ARE NOT BEING OPENED JUST BECAUSE THE COMPLAINTS ARE BEING REFERRED TO OTHER FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGISTS?
A	I DON'T KNOW. WHICH ACTIVATED STANDARD 1.05 FOR ME. IT'S NOT BEING APPROPRIATELY ADDRESSED, SO I MADE A PETITION TO THE APA AND INCLUDED THE 20,000 PARENTS TO REPRESENT OR TO EMPOWER THE PARENTS, WHO IT WOULD BE PARENTS IN CONTACT WITH THE APA REGARDING THEIR CONCERNS.
Q	NOW, WHEN YOU SAY THEY'RE NOT EVEN BEING OPENED, IF SOMEONE MAKES THE ALLEGATION THAT THE STANDARD HAS BEEN VIOLATED AND LITERALLY NO INVESTIGATION, NOTHING IS OPENED -- WHAT HAPPENS TO THE COMPLAINT?

A	I CAN'T SPEAK TO WHAT HAPPENS TO IT, WHAT THE BOARD DOES. THE REPORTS I'M GETTING FROM PARENTS CONTACTING ME THAT SAY NO INVESTIGATION WAS DONE.
Q	WITH REGARDS TO -- WELL, TO WHOM DO THESE COMPLAINTS GO? IN OTHER WORDS, WHEN YOU WRITE A COMPLAINT, WHO DOES IT GO TO?
A	THE LICENSING BOARD OF THE STATE.
Q	OKAY. SO IS THAT LICENSING BOARD ANSWERABLE TO AN AUTHORITY?
A	NOT THAT I'M AWARE OF. POTENTIALLY THERE'S A LARGER PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION BUT NOT -- NOT THAT I'M AWARE OF LEGISLATIVELY.
Q	THEY ARE NOT ANSWERABLE TO APA, IS THAT FAIR TO SAY?
A	YES, THAT'S FAIR TO SAY.
Q	IS THERE A REASON THEN THAT YOU HAVE ADDRESSED THE PETITION TO APA?
A	BECAUSE THEY'RE MY PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION AND THE ETHICS CODES THAT I'M OPERATING UNDER IS STANDARD 1.05. IT REFERENCES VARIOUS OPTIONS, AMONG THAT WOULD BE AN APPROPRIATE OPTION OF ME TO CONTACT THE APA ON THIS. I ALSO WENT TO THE AFCC NATIONAL CONVENTION AND PRESENTED TO THEM. SO I'M TAKING ADDITIONAL STEPS TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE.
Q	WHY IS IT THAT -- WELL, YOU HAVE INDICATED THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO HAVE INTERPRETED THIS REQUEST TO THE APA AS AN ADVANCEMENT OF A PERSONAL THEORY OF ALIENATION. HOW IS IT THAT YOU'RE AWARE THAT THAT CONCEPT IS BEING...
A	IT IS A FREQUENT QUESTION I RECEIVE ON TESTIMONY. THEY REFER TO MY HAVING SOME SORT OF NEW THEORY THAT HAS NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY, AND THEY NARROW THAT DOWN SOMETIMES.
Q	OKAY. SO YOU FIRST BECAME AWARE OF THIS PERCEPTION THROUGH QUESTIONING ON THE STAND THAT'S WHERE YOU'VE BEEN QUALIFIED AS AN EXPERT?
A	YES. THAT'S THE PERC- -- I'M AWARE OF THAT ARGUMENT FROM

	JUST THE GENERAL FACEBOOK AND VARIOUS THINGS, BUT THAT'S THE FIRST TIME I'VE ENCOUNTERED IT DIRECTLY.
Q	OKAY. SO TELL ME WHAT YOU SEE ON FACEBOOK?
A	THAT'S TYPICALLY NOT THE ATTACKS ON ANY OF THE CONTENT. THEY'RE ATTACKS ON MY CHARACTER, THEY'RE, YOU KNOW, ATTACKS ON MY MOTIVATIONS. AND THERE'S A PROPOSITION THAT I HAVE SOME SORT OF NEW THEORY THAT'S NOT ACCEPTED WITHIN PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY.
Q	ARE THERE ANY SERIOUS PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGISTS THAT HAVE STEPPED FORWARD AND SAID - AND BY PROFESSIONAL, I MEAN LICENSED -- 'CAUSE I KNOW WE TALKED ABOUT ANOTHER PSYCHOLOGIST, BUT SOMEONE WHO'S LICENSED, HAS INDICATED THAT YOU HAVE ADOPTED SOME SORT OF THEORY THAT SHOULD NOT BE ACCEPTED?
A	NOT THAT I'M AWARE.
Q	EXCUSE ME A SECOND. I'M JUST GOING TO GO OVER MY NOTES SO YOU USED AN INTERESTING TERM WHICH WAS "FLYING MONKEYS." YOU INDICATED THAT WAS AN URBAN DICTIONARY TERM. HOW DID YOU ENCOUNTER THAT URBAN DICTIONARY TERM?
A	I WAS DESCRIBING THE PROCESS ON MY FACEBOOK PAGE OF THAT SOCIAL DISTRIBUTION FEATURE, AND I RECEIVED A COMMENT FROM SOMEONE THAT SAID, HAVE YOU SEEN THE -- HAVE YOU HEARD THE DEFINITION OF FLYING MONKEYS? AND I'D NEVER HEARD THAT ABOUT IT. I'M IN A DIFFERENT DOMAIN, I'M FROM CHILD ABUSE AND ADHD -- AND SO I LOOKED IT UP ON URBAN DICTIONARY AND IT SAID IT'S APPROPRIATE, SO I'VE BEEN USING IT SINCE THEN.
Q	OKAY. WAS THIS A COLLEAGUE WHO CONTACTED YOU WITH THIS TERM?
A	I THINK IT WAS A PARENT. IT WAS A FACEBOOK ON A COMMENT TO MY FACEBOOK POST, AND I BELIEVE IT WAS A PARENT.
Q	OKAY. AND IS THE PURPOSE OF USING THIS TERM TO MAKE THE CONCEPT ACCEPTABLE TO NON-LICENSED PEOPLE OR IS IT USED AMONG LICENSED PEOPLE?
A	IT'S TO MAKE IT -- IT'S TO HIGHLIGHT THE TERM BECAUSE IT HAS A CATCHY KIND OF LABEL TO IT, AND IT HIGHLIGHTS THE SOCIAL DISTRIBUTION FEATURE OF THIS PATHOLOGY THAT NO

	OTHER PATHOLOGY HAS. IT'S A NARCISSISTIC PATHOLOGY, IT ASSOCIATES WITH A NARCISSISTIC PATHOLOGY, SO I'M HIGHLIGHTING THAT FEATURE BY THE USE OF THE TERM.
Q	OKAY. AND BASED ON WHAT YOU WERE TELLING US FRIDAY, DOES IT START WITH INDIVIDUALS, PATHOLOGICAL INDIVIDUAL COURT CASES? IS THAT WHERE IT STARTS?
A	IT'S IN THE SURROUND. SO THERE ARE A NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO, FOR A VARIETY OF REASONS, SEEK TO DISCREDIT ME, DISCREDIT MY TESTIMONY. AND THEY FIND THE PARENTS WHO ARE LOCATED -- WHO ARE INVOLVED IN THESE CASES, AND THAT I'M TESTIFYING IN. AND THEN THEY GET TOGETHER AND PUT TOGETHER THEIR ARGUMENTS AND CASES RELEVANT TO MY TESTIMONY OR MS. PRUTER'S WORK. THEY ARE SURROUNDING HER WORK CONSIDERABLY.
Q	OKAY. SO IN CASES WHERE THE COURT HAS MADE A FINDING, AND THERE'S AN ORDER OF PROTECTIVE SEPARATION AND THEN THE PROCESS THAT YOU'VE DESCRIBED, WHERE WE ASSESS THE PARENT WHO HAS PERPETRATED THE ABUSE, AND IT'S THE PARENTS WHO ARE THE SUBJECT OF THOSE KIND OF ORDERS, THOSE PEOPLE ARE CONTACTED?
A	THEY ARE CONTACTED OR REACH OUT TO. THE INTERNET ALLOWS A GREAT DEAL OF ACCESS, SO A FEW APPROPRIATE GOOGLE SEARCHES AND THE NETWORK INDICATES.
Q	OKAY. I ASKED YOU IF YOU WERE FAMILIAR WITH THESE PROTECTIVE ORDERS. THESE ORDERS ARE GENERALLY FAMILY COURT ORDERS AND PART OF THE PUBLIC RECORD?
A	I'M NOT SURE THE PUBLIC RECORD, BUT THEY ARE GENERALLY FAMILY COURT ORDERS.
Q	SO MS. ██████████ ASKED A NUMBER OF TIMES IF YOU THOUGHT THAT DR. MERCER SUFFERED FROM A PATHOLOGY AND YOU WERE DRAWING A DISTINCTION BETWEEN HER PARTICIPATING IN A PATHOLOGY AND DIAGNOSING OF HER. CAN YOU EXPLAIN THAT DISTINCTION?
A	PARTLY IT DERIVES FROM STANDARD 9.01 WHICH REQUIRES THAT WE CONDUCT A PERSONAL ASSESSMENT OF PEOPLE BEFORE WE MAKE A DIAGNOSIS OR DIAGNOSTIC STATEMENTS ABOUT THEM. AND IT JUST -- ALL OF US I THINK CAN APPRECIATE WE WOULDN'T LIKE MENTAL HEALTH PEOPLE DIAGNOSING US WITHOUT TALKING WITH US. AND SO THAT'S JUST A GENERAL RESTRICTION ON HOW WE APPROACH

	<p>DIAGNOSIS. THE SECOND ELEMENT IS THERE'S A DISTINCTION BETWEEN WHAT THE PATHOLOGY IS AND WHAT ANY INDIVIDUAL'S MOTIVATION IS. SO, YOU KNOW, THERE COULD BE A VARIETY OF INDIVIDUAL MOTIVATIONS THAT WOULD REQUIRE DIRECT DISCUSSION FOR ATTRIBUTING MOTIVATION OR INTENT.</p>
Q	<p>IN TERMS OF THIS GROUP THAT HAS SOUGHT TO DISCREDIT YOU, HOW DO WE DISTINGUISH THE ACTIVITIES IN WHICH THEY ENGAGE FROM THE DEBATE WITH REGARDS TO ISSUES OF INTERFERENCE WITH PARENTAL ATTACHMENT?</p>
A	<p>I WOULD GO TO THE -- WHETHER ITS CONTENT CRITICISM OR EXTRANEOUS FACTOR CRITICISMS. IF THERE'S CRITICISM OF CONTENT THAT'S ABSOLUTELY APPROPRIATE AND THAT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD BE ENGAGED. EXTRANEOUS PERSONAL ATTACKS ON CHARACTER OR INCORRECT CHARACTERIZATIONS, UNFOCUSED SITUATIONS ARE NOT HELPFUL OR PRODUCTIVE.</p>
Q	<p>I THINK I'M ALMOST DONE. LET ME REVIEW MY NOTES REAL QUICKLY. SO WITH REGARDS TO THE SHARED DELUSION IN WHICH YOU HAVE FOUND YOURSELF ENGAGED, YOU'VE DEFINED WHAT A DELUSION IS. WELL, WHAT -- WHAT -- WHAT IS THE DELUSION THAT'S BEING ADVANCED BY THIS GROUP?</p>
A	<p>THE BROAD CATEGORY IS OF THOUGHT DISORDER. THE TYPE OF THOUGHT DISORDER IS A DELUSION. IT'S A FALSE BELIEF MAINTAINED DESPITE CONTRARY EVIDENCE. THE TYPE OF DELUSION IS CALLED A PERSECUTORY DELUSION. THE BELIEF, A FALSE BELIEF IN VICTIMIZATION. SO THAT'S THE ORGANIZING THEME OF THIS PARTICULAR PATHOLOGY, IS A FALSE BELIEF IN SUPPOSED VICTIMIZATION, AND THEN THEY ARE ATTACKING OUT, LASHING OUT AT WHO THEY BELIEVE ARE THEIR ABUSERS OR MALTREATERS.</p>
Q	<p>OKAY. BUT IS IT -- IS THERE A REASON -- WELL, LET'S TAKE THE EXAMPLE OF A PARENT WHO IS THE SUBJECT OF A PROTECTIVE ORDER, RIGHT, PROTECTIVE SEPARATION. LET'S ASSUME THAT THAT HAS OCCURRED DUE TO YOUR TESTIMONY IN A NUMBER OF CASES. ARE THEY DELUDED IN BLAMING YOU FOR PRESENTING THE INFORMATION THAT ULTIMATELY LED TO THAT ORDER WHICH -- WITH WHICH THEY DISAGREE OR WHICH THEY FIND OBJECTIONABLE?</p>
A	<p>I WOULD NOT CALL THAT A DELUSION, A THOUGHT DISORDER. THAT'S RETALIATORY REVENGE TO DRIVE ME AWAY AND PREVENT ME FROM CONTINUING MY WORK.</p>
Q	<p>AND IS THERE AN ELEMENT OF THAT IN THIS GROUP?</p>

A YES.

Q WHAT IS -- TO HELP ME UNDERSTAND -- I KNOW WE'RE SPENDING A LOT OF TIME ON IT, BUT HELP ME UNDERSTAND. SO WHO IS IN THE DELUSION AND WHO IS THE RETALIATION 'CAUSE IT SOUNDS LIKE THEY'RE PART OF THE SAME GROUP?

A THEY ARE PART OF THE SAME GROUP, BUT THE RETALIATION IS -- COMES OUT OF THE DELUSION BUT ITSELF BUT IT'S NOT -- THEY'RE NOT -- THEY DON'T HAVE A FIXED AND FALSE BELIEF THAT THEY WANT TO HARM ME. THAT'S A REAL BELIEF THAT THEY WANT. THEY WANT ME AWAY. THEY WANT ME TO STOP TESTIFYING. THEY BELIEVE, FOR VARIOUS REASONS, THAT I'M SOMEHOW HARMING CHILDREN OR I CAN'T SPEAK FOR WHAT THE MOTIVATIONS ARE. BUT THEY'RE -- THAT INTENT TO DISCREDIT ME. AND IT'S PART OF THE COURT SYSTEM BECAUSE WE HAVE A CONFLICT IN THE ADVERSARIAL SYSTEM. SO THERE'S A DESIRE TO DISCREDIT MY TESTIMONY, AND -- SO THAT'S WHERE SOME OF THE SLANDER, MISCHARACTERIZATIONS COME FROM. BUT I CAN'T SPEAK -- BUT IT'S THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEIR EFFORTS TO RETALIATE AGAINST ME VERSUS THE FALSE BELIEFS THAT CAUSE IT.

Q WITH REGARDS TO THE ISSUE OF COMPLAINTS NOT BEING OPENED BY FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGISTS ON OTHER FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGISTS, IS THERE A -- WELL, DO YOU HAVE A DIRECT CONCERN ABOUT PEERS REVIEWING THEMSELVES?

A A DIRECT CONCERN ABOUT WHAT?

Q PEERS REVIEWING THEMSELVES. IN OTHER WORDS, THE PEOPLE WHO ARE PART OF THE SAME GROUP REVIEWING THEIR MEMBERS?

A YES, ABSOLUTELY, ALL THE TIME.

Q OKAY. AND WHAT IS IT THAT YOU THINK MIGHT BE A BETTER APPROACH TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE WITH REGARDS TO FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGISTS WHO ARE EMPLOYING PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSTRUCTS OR PARADIGMS THAT ARE NOT SUPPORTED BY RESEARCH OR FACT?

A THAT WOULD BE REMEDY THREE. I BELIEVE WE NEED GREATER GUIDANCE FROM THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, AND THEN BASED ON THAT, I WOULD RECOMMEND THAT SOME LEGISLATURES RELOOK OR REEXAMINE THEIR CHILD ABUSE LAWS, REPORTING LAWS RELATIVE TO PSYCHOLOGICAL CHILD ABUSE TO PROVIDE GREATER GUIDANCE TO THE COURTS IN MAKING THEIR

DECISION REGARDING THE STATUS .

Q OKAY. SO IS THIS PETITION TO THE APA A FIRST STEP IN ORDER TO GET GUIDANCE FOR POLITICAL ORGANIZATION -- I'M SORRY, POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS?

A THAT'S CORRECT.

NOW, I UNDERSTAND. ALL RIGHT.