



FALSE MEMORY SYNDROME FOUNDATION NEWSLETTER

SUMMER 2010 Vol. 19 No. 3

Dear Friends,

Some interesting legal decisions have occurred since the last newsletter. In May, a North Carolina Superior Court judge made a precedent setting ruling that testimony regarding “repressed” and “recovered” memory was to be excluded from a criminal rape trial. The decision came after a pre-trial hearing that featured contrasting arguments from Dr. Harrison G. Pope and Dr. James A. Chu, both at McLean Hospital in Massachusetts. (See p. 9) The prosecution has stated that it intends to appeal, but if this ruling is upheld, it would effectively deny admission of any recovered memory testimony in North Carolina criminal cases.

The Governor of Arizona signed a bill in May that tightens the standards for expert testimony in civil cases. The change replaces the decade-old 2000 Arizona Supreme Court decision in Logerquist v. Danforth in which the Court held that rules regarding scientific evidence do not apply to something as unscientific as repressed memory. That Court was confident that jurors could determine the reliability of testimony by expert witnesses “as least as right as the trial judge.” The new legislation brings Arizona’s legal system into line with evidence standards used in federal courts and most state courts. Long-time readers of the *FMSF Newsletter* may recall the 11 articles devoted to Logerquist. It was as difficult to understand the Arizona Court’s thinking then as it has been to understand the Massachusetts Court’s decision in Shanley ^[1]this year.

Claims of “repressed and recovered” memories brought by alleged victims represent just one of many problems with witness testimony. Recall that in the early 1990s, some people actually argued that “repressed and recovered” memories were even better than ordinary memories because they had been encapsulated and were thus pristine. Anyone who argued that today would likely be considered woefully outdated. Much has been learned in the past two decades about the reliability of “repressed and recovered” memories.

Another problem in the courts is the reliability of eye-

witness testimony. New Jersey, which is already a national leader in the area of improving procedures with eyewitness testimony, has just completed a massive inquiry on that problem. The report’s author, retired Judge Geoffrey Gaulkin, has recommended that New Jersey go beyond what any state or federal court system has done. He has recommended that judges assess factors that might limit a witness’s reliability in picking someone out of a lineup, either in person or in a photo array.^[2]

Problems with eyewitness identification became known because of DNA testing. About three-quarters of the 254 defendants exonerated by DNA testing were convicted based mostly on eyewitness testimony. According to Gaulkin, research has shown that about one-third of witnesses who pick out suspects choose the wrong person. If the New Jersey recommendations are followed, and it seems likely that they will be, prosecutors will be required to prove the reliability of an eyewitness during a pretrial hearing.

The Tonya Craft case in Georgia highlights the potential problems with children’s testimony. When is it reliable? (See p. 7) Certainly not when the children are offered rewards or given suggestive questions as they were in the Craft case. In May, a jury found the kindergarten teacher not guilty of molesting three children, one of whom was her own. But this was not before Tonya lost her children and her job and she and her parents spent approximately \$500,000 for her defense.

In 2010, how could a person be falsely accused and lose everything when so much is now known about proper interview techniques with children, about claims of recovered repressed memories, and about eyewitness identification?

In this issue...

<i>Legal Corner</i>	9
<i>From Our Readers</i>	11
<i>Bulletin Board</i>	13

The next newsletter will be sent in October 2010.

Unfortunately, people are still being accused and sometimes convicted based on testimony that is tainted, whether by therapeutic influence, poor interviewing, or poor police identification procedures. Sadly, the problem persists and defending such cases places a huge financial burden on the accused. Those who do not have the resources for experts and investigations may be convicted. In this issue, there is a revealing letter from someone who was convicted. (See p. 12) This person did not have financial resources and relied on a public defender. He describes an apology he received from the accuser. Will he ever be able to clear his name?

Fortunately, there have been many (but not enough) hard-working, caring attorneys who have been heroes in some cases. The late attorney Donald Fiedler in Omaha persisted in studying the research on suggestion and followed up by exposing the problems with a cognitive interview that lasted 30 hours. The “memories” recovered in that interview were the basis of a lawsuit against his client. Whitehouse and colleagues have written a brilliant analysis of that case and the problems with that particular cognitive interview and the assumptions behind it. (See p. 6).

New books still appear. Some seem caught in a time warp. (See *A Long Journey to Joy*, p. 6) Others push understanding forward. For example, a book by Lilienfeld (See p. 6) called *50 Great Myths of Popular Psychology* informs readers:

“Today, there’s broad consensus among psychologists that memory isn’t *reproductive*—it doesn’t duplicate precisely what we’ve experienced—but *reconstructive*. What we recall is often a blurry mixture of accurate and inaccurate recollections, along with what jells with our beliefs and hunches. Rather than viewing our memory as a tape recorder, we can more aptly describe our memory as an ever-changing medium that highlights our ability to create fluid narratives of our experiences.”

New articles, both popular and scholarly, have not slowed down. A truly informative and fun popular series of articles entitled “The Memory Doctor: The Future of False Memories” by William Saletan appeared online in *Slate*. (See p. 5) Based on the work of Elizabeth Loftus, the series emphasizes that memory is mutable and memories can be changed, especially in the context of faked images. The first

“The means to secure a fair trial for an accused faced with historic allegations lie in careful directions to the jury which expose the difficulties created for accused persons and at the same time to remind the jury of the frailty of human memory in the context of the particular allegations made and the time frame concerned.”

Lord Justice Higgins

Reported in Sexual abuse convictions quashed, BBC News, May 31, 2010. Retrieved on 6/1/2010 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/northern_ireland/10197912.stm

articles in the series, ‘The Ministry of Truth,’ is a reference to George Orwell’s *1984*. *Slate*, with electronic access to thousands of readers, conducted its own study: A mass experiment in altering political memories. Five thousand two-hundred seventy nine people participated in the experiment during the first three days it was posted. And... you’ll have to read the article to learn what the researchers found out. This is a terrific series to suggest to someone you think should know more about claims of repressed memories.

Sometimes it seems that we progress two steps and then fall back one. These past few months, it has seemed to be slow but steady progress.

We wish you a very happy summer.

Pamela

1. See FMSF Newsletter 18(4) for review of [Shanley](http://www.fmsfonline.org/fmsf09.o06.html) decision. <http://www.fmsfonline.org/fmsf09.o06.html>
 2. Perez-Pena, R. (2010, June 21) Use of eyewitnesses in Jew Jersey Courts Needs Change, Ex-Judge Says. New York Times. Retrieved on 6/21/10 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/22/nyregion/22witness.html>.
- Lounsberry, E. (2010, June 28). N.J. is a leader in questioning eyewitness testimony. Philadelphia Inquirer, B1.



Who Would Have Gessed? ‘Robin Hood’ Recovered Repressed Memories

The new movie “Robin Hood” is not the usual story of a gallant archer and a band of Merry Men. Instead, the movie is about the origin of Robin Hood and how that band of Merry Men came to be. “Today’s Robin Hood is far more complex, a tortured soul suffering from repressed-memory syndrome.”^[1]

Even though the cast features stars Russell Crowe and Cate Blanchett, reviews have been generally negative. For example: “Simultaneously simplistic and over-plotted, revisionist and predictable, this “Robin Hood” has trouble getting untracked and, once it does, proves an awkward mix of international geopolitics, repressed memory, old-fashioned villainy, human rights advocacy, the Magna Carta and pigeons that send secret messages.”^[2]

Just what is the repressed memory? Through the use of repressed-memory flashbacks, viewers learn that Robin Hood’s father actually wrote the Magna Carta!

1. Zacharek, S. (2010, May 12). Ugly, interminable Robin Hood steals from audiences. Retrieved on 5/25/10 from <http://www.movieline.com/2010/05/review-ugly-interminable-robin-hood-steals-from-audiences.php>
2. Turan, K. (2010, May 13). Movie review: ‘Robin Hood’ is all over the Sherwood Forest. Los Angeles Times. Retrieved on 5/13/10 from <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/may/13/entertainment/la-et-robin-hood-20100513>



In Memoriam
MARTIN GARDNER
FMSF Advisor

Martin Gardner died on May 22, 2010 in Norman, Oklahoma. He was 95. Although his work spanned many areas, countless people knew about and were influenced by Martin Gardner because of the mathematical puzzles column that he wrote for 25 years in *Scientific American*. Indeed, the American Mathematics Society awarded the prestigious Steele Prize for Mathematical Exposition to Gardner in 1987 for his efforts to introduce mathematical concepts and challenges to the public.

FMS Foundation members know Martin Gardner for his tireless efforts to expose the pseudoscientific foundations of the ideas surrounding belief in recovered memories. He first wrote about the problem of FMS in 1993 in his *Skeptical Inquirer* column 'Notes of a Fringe-Watcher,' and he continued to write about the damage caused by FMS whenever he could.

Gardner was the consummate skeptic and debunker of claims of the paranormal. He published 70 books and wrote fiction, poetry and literary and film criticism in addition to his mathematical work. "He was so prolific and wide-ranging in his interests that critics speculated that there just had to be more than one of him," wrote Douglas Martin in a *New York Times* obituary.

In 'Quack Detector,' a 1982 *New York Review of Books* essay about Gardner's book *Science: Good, Bad and Bogus*, Stephen Jay Gould wrote that Martin Gardner "has become a priceless national resource," a writer "who can combine wit, penetrating analysis, sharp prose, and sweet reason into an expansive view that expunges nonsense without stifling innovation, and that presents the excitement and humanity of science in a positive way...."

Mr. Gardner held hope that the

repressed memory bugaboo would be dispelled. In 1995 he told us: "I think jurors, attorneys, judges, and media bigwigs are slowly becoming educated about the crisis." He believed that a successful resolution to the recovered memory therapy issue would likely hinge on courtroom developments. Events have proven him correct. It is fitting that Douglas Hofstadter said: "Martin Gardner [was] one of the great intellects produced in this country in the 20th century." With that we most certainly agree, but would add that his intellect was framed in kindness and concern for humanity.

Gardner, M. (1993). Notes of a fringe-watcher: The false memory syndrome. *Skeptical Inquirer*, 17, 370-375.

Gould, S.J. (1992, February 4). Quack detector. *New York Review of Books*. Retrieved on 6/2/10 from

<http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/1982/feb/04/the-quack-detector/>

Hofstadter, D. Quoted in Martin, D. (2010, May 23). Martin Gardner, puzzler and polymath, dies at 95. *New York Times*. Retrieved on 6/12/10 from

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/24/us/24gardner.html>

Martin, D. (2010, May 23). Martin Gardner, puzzler and polymath, dies at 95. *New York Times*. Retrieved on 6/12/10 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/24/us/24gardner.html>



Update from New Zealand

Here in NZ, the main issue is the October 2009 change in the way in which Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC) claims for mental injury resulting from sexual abuse are being handled. Such claims cost taxpayers around \$47 - \$48 Million a year, including approximately \$10 million a year for counselors.

The relevant legislation, enacted by the Labor Government in 2001, requires claimants to have been mentally injured as a result of a sexual crime as defined in the Crimes Act - not very different to what the earlier versions of that Act said. Counselors in NZ are mainly unregistered and are not competent to make diagnoses of

that nature. In the past, neither ACC nor Counselors bothered to get a proper diagnosis of the mental injury, and asking for proof of the sexual crime was unheard of.

ACC's new administrative approach—prompted by a Government directive to review its processes and reduce costs where possible—is to apply the legislation much more rigorously by demanding a professional diagnosis of the claimed mental injury.

The Counselors have been attacking ACC for making the changes. Some ninety articles have been published in newspapers and other media since last October. I have been busy writing replies to many of the articles. And so the battle continues.

Gordon Waugh



Two Books of Interest

50 Great Myths of Popular Psychology: Shattering Widespread Misconceptions about Human Behavior.

Scott O Lilienfeld, Steven Jay Lynn, John Ruscio, Barry L Beyerstein
Wiley-Blackwell, 2009

In a most readable fashion, Lilienfeld and colleagues "unpack myths that many, including most psychologists, believe and accept are fact, but there may indeed be no evidence for them." [1] Following are some of the myths that they address as described by them on Amazon:

Myth # 1: "Most people use only 10% of their brain power. There are several reasons to doubt that 90% of the human brain of most people lies silent. At a mere 2-3% of our body weight, our brain consumes over 20% of the oxygen we breathe. It's implausible that evolution would have permitted the squandering of resources on a scale necessary to build and maintain such a massively underutilized organ. Moreover, losing far less than 90% of the brain to accident or disease almost always has catastrophic consequences (Kolb & Whishaw, 2003).

"How did the 10% myth get start-

ed? One clue leads back about a century to psychologist William James, who once wrote that he doubted that average persons achieve more than about 10% of their *intellectual potential*. Although James talked in terms of underdeveloped potential, a slew of positive thinking gurus transformed “10% of our capacity” into “10% of our brain” (Beyerstein, 1999).

Myth # 2: “*It’s better to express anger than to hold it in.* If you’re like most people, you believe that releasing anger is healthier than bottling it up. In one survey, 66% of undergraduates agreed that expressing pent-up anger—sometimes called “catharsis”—is an effective means of reducing one’s risk for aggression (Brown, 1983).

“Yet more than 40 years of research reveals that expressing anger directly toward another person or indirectly (such as toward an object) actually turns up the heat on aggression (Bushman, Baumeister, & Stack, 1999; Tavis, 1988). Research suggests that expressing anger is helpful only when it’s accompanied by constructive problem-solving designed to address the source of the anger (Littrell, 1998).

“Why is this myth so popular? In all likelihood, people often mistakenly attribute the fact that they feel better after they express anger to catharsis, rather than to the fact that anger usually subsides on its own after awhile. (Lohr, Olatunji, Baumeister, & Bushman, 2007).”

Myth # 3: “*Low Self-Esteem is a Major Cause of Psychological Problems.* Many popular psychologists have long maintained that low self-esteem is a prime culprit in generating unhealthy behaviors, including violence, depression, anxiety, and alcoholism. The self-esteem movement has found its way into mainstream educational practices. Some athletic leagues award trophies to all schoolchildren to avoid making losing competitors feel inferior (Sommers & Satel, 2005).

Moreover, the Internet is chock full of educational products intended to boost children’s self-esteem.

“But there’s a fly in the ointment: Research shows that low self esteem isn’t strongly associated with poor mental health. In a painstakingly—and probably painful!—review, Roy Baumeister and his colleagues (2003) canvassed over 15,000 studies linking self-esteem to just about every conceivable psychological variable. They found that self-esteem is minimally related to interpersonal success, and not consistently related to alcohol or drug abuse. Perhaps most surprising of all, they found that “low self-esteem is neither necessary nor sufficient for depression” (Baumeister et al., 2003, p. 6).”

Myth # 4: “*Human memory works like a tape recorder or video camera, and accurately records the events we’ve experienced.* Despite the sometimes all-too-obvious failings of everyday memory, surveys show that many people believe that their memories operate very much like tape recorders, video cameras, or DVDs. It’s true that we often recall extremely emotional events, sometimes called *flashbulb memories* because they seem to have a photographic quality (Brown & Kulik, 1977). Nevertheless, research shows that even these memories wither over time and are prone to distortions (Krackow, Lynn, & Payne, 2005-2006).

“Today, there’s broad consensus among psychologists that memory isn’t *reproductive*—it doesn’t duplicate precisely what we’ve experienced—but *reconstructive*. What we recall is often a blurry mixture of accurate and inaccurate recollections, along with what jells with our beliefs and hunches. Rather than viewing our memory as a tape recorder, we can more aptly describe our memory as an ever-changing medium that highlights our ability to create fluid narratives of our experiences.”

Myth # 5: “*Hypnosis is a unique “trance” state that differs in kind from wakefulness.* Popular movies and books portray the hypnotic trance state as so powerful that otherwise normal people will commit an assassination (*The Manchurian Candidate*); commit suicide (*The Garden Murders*); perceive only a person’s internal beauty (*Shallow Hal*); and our favorite, fall victim to brainwashing by alien preachers who use messages embedded in sermons (*Invasion of the Space Preachers*).

“But research shows that hypnotized people can resist and even oppose hypnotic suggestions (Lynn, Rhue, & Weekes, 1990; Nash, 2001), and won’t do things that are out of character, like harming people they dislike. In addition, hypnosis bears no more than a superficial resemblance to sleep: Brain wave studies reveal that hypnotized people are wide awake.

“So there’s no reason to believe that hypnosis differs in kind from normal wakefulness. Instead, hypnosis appears to be only one procedure among many for increasing people’s responses to suggestions.”

More information about each of these myths and a complete list of references are available in *50 Great Myths of Popular Psychology*. Many myths are easily recognized as false by most people. Some, however, such as the idea that severe child abuse invariably causes lasting psychological damage, are more persistent and require a careful analysis of the evidence to help people understand.

Chapter three of *50 Great Myths of Popular Psychology* covers myths about memory. It is great to see accurate information about memory presented in such a compelling manner. Now, if only therapists and interviewers read it!

1. Sugarman, R. (2010, June 22). Psychology. Review. Metapsychology online reviews. Vol. 14, Issue 25)Retrieved on 6/22/10 from http://metapsychology.mentalhelp.net/poc/view_doc.php?type=book&id=5609&cn=396.

* * *

Memory Matters: Contexts for Understanding Sexual Abuse Recollections

Haaken, J. & Reavey, P. (Eds.)
Routledge, 2010

Memory Matters is an edited collection of articles by authors with feminist and critical perspectives within psychology. The editors note:

“More than any other issue in the late twentieth century, the recovered memory debate polarized the mental health field and legal community, with feminists—both in academia and in service work—heavily aligned with the recovered memory side of the controversy.” (P. 1)

Haaken and Reavey believe that the controversy is far enough past that they can now look at the issues with some perspective. *Memory Matters*

“grew out of an effort to collectively reflect on this period of controversy, and to sort through the issue from the vantage point of some historical distance.” (p. 2)

The editors believe that the subject of repression and false memories has generally faded from public view.

“[I]n this book we argue that neither of the dominant positions in the ‘war’ over memory—the true versus false memory positions—decisively prevailed in public or academic discourse over childhood memory. Although some softened hardline positions, others turned away entirely from the issues because of the bitter acrimony generated by moral claims on both sides. We began this collection of papers with the premise that memory may ‘matter’ more or less, given a specific context, and that there are many ‘matters’ concerning everyday contexts shaping processes of remembering that have yet to be addressed. (p. 2)

From the editors:

“[W]hat matters about recovered memory is not solely whether the events recounted are literally ‘true’ or not, but rather the ways in which

women are able to articulate multiple and at times ambiguous meanings in relations to sexuality, embodiment and emotional distress.” (Ashmore & Brown, p. 19)

At this point most FMSF Newsletter readers are probably ready to shout: “Wait! When you are accused of a heinous crime, the truth or falsity of an accusation most certainly does matter!”

We suspect none of the authors would disagree. Their interest, however, is examining the repressed and recovered memory controversy from the sociological and feminist perspectives of the role of women in our society.

“A primary aim of this volume is to bring into focus key historical dynamics and contests over power that shape the terms of storied forms of remembering, and particularly in matters concerning sexuality and childhood.” (p. 2)

That is certainly a legitimate perspective, and it may help to bring understanding of the issues to people who are uncomfortable with a focus on the psychological memory issues. Although it will not help people understand the effect on someone of being falsely accused and the single-minded intensity with which a falsely accused person works to have his name and character restored, we were pleased to note that the False Memory Syndrome Foundation is referenced respectfully in this volume and described accurately:

“By the early 1990s an organization formed in the United States, the False Memory Syndrome Foundation, which mounted a campaign to establish the role of suggestibility in producing evidence of ‘false’ memories.” (p. 2)

The book is scholarly but accessible to FMSF readers. It seems to be aimed at students and practitioners.

Table of Contents

J. Haaken, p. Reavey, Why Memory Still Matters: Disturbing Recollection.

Section 1: Looking Back on the Recovered

Memory Debate: Claims and Counter-claims. *M. Ashmore, S.D. Brown*, On Changing One’s Mind Twice: The Strange Credibility of Retracting Recovered Memories.

J. Ost, K. Nunkoosing, Reconstructing Bartlett and Revisiting Retractions of Contested Claims of Abuse.

J.F. Motzkau, Speaking Up Against Justice: Credibility, Suggestibility and Children’s Memory on Trial.

J. Kitlinger, Transformations of Public and Private Knowledge: Audience Reception, Feminism and the Experience of Childhood Sexual Abuse.

J. Woodiwiss, ‘Alternative Memories’ and the Construction of a Sexual Abuse Narrative.

Section 2: Widening the Lens: Cultural Contexts for Remembering Child Sexual Abuse.

p. Reavey, The Spaces of Memory: Rethinking Agency Through Materiality.

K. Robson, ‘Truth’, Memory and Narrative in Memoirs of Child Sexual Abuse.

R. Fyson, J. Cromby, Memory, Sexual Abuse and the Politics of Learning Disability.

S. Campbell, Memory, Truth, and the Search for an Authentic Past.

E. Burman, Therapy as Memory-work: Dilemmas of Discovery, Recovery and Construction.

J. Haaken, Transformative Remembering: Feminism, Psychoanalysis, and Recollections of Abuse.

To view some of the book go to:
<http://www.psypress.com/common/sample-chapters/9780415444910.pdf>



Slate Series Features Work of Elizabeth Loftus

The Memory Doctor: The Future of False Memories

By William Saletan, *Slate Magazine*.
<http://www.slate.com/id/2256089/>

‘The Memory Doctor’ is an information packed series of eight articles grounded in the memory research of Elizabeth Loftus, Ph.D. Not only is the material fascinating, the comments from readers that follow the articles reveal what *Slate* readers think about and know about memory and false memories. All the articles can be accessed through the URL above.

The series opens with a bang. The title, ‘The Ministry of Truth,’ is a reference to George Orwell’s *1984*. Memory is mutable and memories can be changed, especially in the context of

faked images. *Slate*, with electronic access to thousands of readers, conducted its own study: A mass experiment in altering political memories.

Five thousand two-hundred seventy nine people participated in the experiment during the first three days it was posted. People were shown both doctored (i.e. a picture of Sen. Joe Lieberman voting to convict President Clinton at his impeachment trial. Lieberman actually voted for acquittal.) and factual photos of events. Each person saw three true incidents and one randomly selected fake incident. At the end, the participants were told that one of the four incidents was fake and were instructed to guess which one. (Readers can see the images following links in the article.)

The results were similar to previous laboratory findings. The average rate of false memories was about 30 percent but when pictures are added the rate goes up.

“In a sample of a highly educated and informed subjects – *Slate* readers – half came to remember bogus political stories as true. Even when they were told that one of the four incidents they had seen was fake, and even when that incident was a complete fabrication, half of this deceived group – and 37% of the overall sample – couldn’t guess which one. A modern-day Ministry of Truth could alter memories on a mass scale.”

“Seeing is believing, even when what you’re seeing is fabricated.”

We highly recommend *The Memory Doctor*. For anyone who wants to explain false memories to others, this is a great resource.

Articles in the series:

Part I: The Ministry of Truth , May 23.

Part II: Removable Truths: A memory expert’s inexpungible past.. May 24.

Part III: Leading the Witness:

Contaminated memories and criminal justice, May 26..

Part IV: The Recipe: A Cookbook for memories of sexual abuse.. May 27.

Part V: Truth or Consequences? May 27.

Part VI: The Road to Therapy, May 29.

Part VII: Training Humans, May 31.

Part VIII: The Future of the past, June 1.



An Extreme Cognitive Interview

Whitehouse, W. G., Orne, E. C., Dinges, D. F. (2010). Extreme Cognitive interviewing: A blueprint for false memories through imagination inflation.

International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis 58(3), 269-287.

What is a cognitive interview? The authors explain:

“As it was originally intended, the cognitive interview consisted of four primary mnemonic components:

(a) Mentally reinstate the context of the event;

(b) Report everything (i.e. don’t censor recollections that you think are unimportant);

(c) Change perspectives (i.e., recall events from the point of view of someone else who witnessed the event);

(d) Recall events in a different order – that were to be implemented as needed in a protocol that emphasized free-narrative, followed by focused-questions and recall formats.”

Over the years the cognitive interview has been revised. This extremely well written article demonstrates how a cognitive interview can be misused in a way to facilitate the development of false memories.

On May 29, 2007, Sarpy County Nebraska District Judge William Zastera ruled that Lenora Kay Parker could not testify about her childhood memories of her mother’s murder in 1971. [1] Parker, who was 4-years-old at the time of the murder, was the chief witness in the case against her father, Donald Sykora. Judge Zastera disallowed Parker’s testimony because her memory had been enhanced by a 30-hour cognitive interview, a technique he said was not scientific and could produce false memories.

According to reports, two federal agents and a police officer interviewed

Lenora Parker for four days in a row. The interview was conducted in a meeting room in a fire station that had been converted to a more relaxing environment with items such as a recliner, a sofa and soft lights.

The purpose of the 30-hour interview in 2004 was to help Lenora Parker remember the details of an alleged vision of her father strangling her mother in 1971. The interview was not tape-recorded. Instead, one officer took notes as he sat in another room and observed. At one point during the interview, the group even left to visit the grave of Parker’s mother.

Whitehouse and colleagues present an analysis of all of the reports, letters, interviews and notes in this case to show convincingly where and how the process went astray. They note that interviews rarely extend beyond four hours. They ask why there was a cognitive interview in the first place. Why, after a length of 33 years “should it even be possible to ‘refresh’ details of an event so far in the past?” They write:

“The very foundation of the notion of traumatic memory loss, recoverable by hypnosis or guided imagery or a prolonged and extreme cognitive interview, is not only questionable but should be rejected out-right based on scientific evidence...”

If you would like a copy of this article, contact the FMSF.

(mail@FMSFonline.org)

1. *FMSF Newsletter* 2009 Vol. 18(2) and 2007 Vol. 16(4) for more information about this case.



Belief in Repressed Memories is Alive and Well in Some Communities

New Book: *A Long Journey to Joy: A Memoir of a Recovery*

Yonah Klem, IUniverse, Inc. New York

Recovery memoirs are powerful documentation of the circumstances that may have influenced the authors to believe that they had recovered “repressed memories” of childhood sexual abuse. Can we tell if the

writers really were abused? We have no way of knowing. We can, however, observe the context in which the “memories” arose and came to be believed. We can conclude whether or not the memories were recovered in a suggestive environment.

A Long Journey to Joy: A Memoir of a Recovery is the self-published story of a highly suggestive therapy climate. Author Yonah Klem, clearly a highly intelligent, kind, and talented person, tells readers that she experienced shame, chronic depression, and anxiety from her early teens but had no idea why. She started to see a therapist while she was in college and found the process so interesting that in 1981 when she was 38-years-old, she entered a doctoral program to become a counselor. Previous to that she had been trained at the Gestalt Institute in Chicago and she had therapy with many professionals, the most influential appearing to be “James.”

“The first time I worked with James [six months before they were both students at the Gestalt Institute in 1977] he led a small group of people in a guided imagery exercise in which we imagined ourselves rising above our bodies and observing our own deaths. I went into a very deep trance state, from which he did not have the skill to help me get completely out. For several days I drifted in and out of a very spacey altered state of consciousness....” (p. 140)

“I had not had any contact with James for another five years until the marathon in 1987. I heard, in the meantime, that he had been studying Reichian Bioenergetics... I was ready to be quite critical. After all, I had immersed myself in Bioenergetic theory, if not practice, and had some opinions on the matter.” (p. 141)

When she was in her late 40s after her mother’s death, Klem came to believe that she had been sexually abused as a child. This happened after a “marathon weekend.”

“The marathon involved some movement and other kinds of body-

work, as well as some kinds of awareness and expressive exercises I was familiar with from other workshops I had attended. In addition, all of the participants did individual work with Ray and James as well. Much more intense feeling came up than I expected, which was startling and unsettling, as if this was all somehow too much, too fast.” (p. 141)

The first memories after the marathon were of abuse by her uncle from ages 7 to 16. (Page 142) Her therapist James asks her if she has ever done a sexual history. “Do you think there’s more?” I asked James. ‘Yes,’ he said, without elaborating.” Klem goes on to recover memories of abuse by her father up until the age of five.

“My work with James was intense and exhausting every time I saw him. Dreams and images and frequent contact with Shama and other Inner Guides provided resources I hadn’t known how to use the first time I was in therapy....” (p. 145)

“Once, in an effort to encourage me to open my mouth and make a sound, James reached over and lightly placed his finger on my chin and then took his hand away. As my lips parted, my throat closed. I could barely breathe. My lungs hurt as if I were suffocating. My heart missed a few beats.

“When I finally settled down, startled and unnerved by what my body has just been doing, I asked James what happened. He said something vague, a speculation about something filling my mouth at some time in the past. After a while, an old memory came to mind, of lying on the dining room chairs of my grandparents’ apartment on a very dark and stormy night. Now there were more details. My arms had been pinned down at my side as someone straddled me and shoved something into my mouth and into my throat. I hadn’t made a sound except for gagging when I was two, and I couldn’t make one in James’s office.” (p. 188)

Klem described more of her therapy including Eye Movement

Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR).

“Several years before, Peg and I learned this powerful technique for dealing with traumatic memories... We did it in James’s office, with me holding on to him with every bit of strength I had.

“In an arduous, terrifying session, it became clear that I never thought I would survive that time in the big room. With much more vivid details this time I could recall how I stood naked off to the side, all the men’s attention on torturing the other girl... (p. 239)

In a recent article about her new book, Yonah Klem is said to refer “to herself as the poster child for repressed memories and strongly disputes the existence of false memory syndrome.”^[1] It seems clear from the descriptions in her book, however, that the author recovered many, if not most, of her memories using therapies known to enhance the development of false memories with a therapist who provided both direct and indirect suggestions.

1. Millen, K. (2010, May 12). At long last, joy. Naperville Sun. Retrieved on 5/17/2010 from http://www.suburbanchicagonews.com/naperville/news/2261230.6_1_NA12_KLEM_S1-100512.article



Georgia Teacher Tonya Craft Acquitted of Molesting Children

On May 11, 2010 in the Georgia Catoosa County Superior Court, a jury of seven men and five women found kindergarten teacher Tonya Craft not guilty of molesting three children, one of whom was her own daughter.

Craft, who is now 37-years-old, was arrested in June of 2008, accused of molesting three girls ages 5 and 6 in her home between August 2005 and May 2007. She subsequently lost not only her job but also custody of her daughter.

Although this is not a “repressed

and recovered-memory” case, it received national coverage and it does highlight two points that pertain to sex abuse cases: first, defending oneself against any charge of child sexual abuse is tremendously expensive. Tonya Craft spent about \$500,000. for her legal defense team. Her parents mortgaged their home and used all of their savings and retirement moneys. Second, ignorance about proper interviewing techniques apparently remains widespread.

There were many conflicting details in the children’s accusations. In addition, experts for the defense pointed out specific areas in which poor interviewing may have contaminated the children’s memories.

For example, William Bernet, M.D. of Vanderbilt Psychiatric Hospital in Nashville testified that “Interviewers need to know how to ask questions the right way and how to allow the child to tell a free narrative of what happened to them.” Dr. Bernet was concerned that the interviews may have rewarded the children for their answers. He noted that in one interview a child mentioned that she would receive a toy when she was done and that in another the child mentioned that she would be getting her hair done.

Dr. Bernet also testified: “There’s another process that’s apparent from the interviews, and that is the little girls appear to be influenced and have gotten information from their parents.”

Nancy Aldridge, Ph.D., a licensed social worker and clinical psychologist also testified for the defense and was also concerned about parental influence. She testified that the parents of the children should not have been making numerous calls to one another. She also cited flaws in the interviews of the children. She said: “By asking the child ‘Did Miss Tonya ever tell you to touch each other,’ what is the impact of that?” That is a suggestive question.

Judge Brian House presided. Assistant District Attorneys Len

Gregor and Chris Arnt prosecuted the case. The defense attorney was Demosthenes Lorandos, Ph.D., J.D. of Lorandos & Associates in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Cook, A. (2010, May 5). Craft trial: psychiatrist criticizes child interviews. *Rome News Tribune*, 7A

Norwood, D. (2010, May 3) Social worked cites “errors” in handling of Tonya Craft accusers. *Chattanooga*. Retrieved on 5/12/10 from http://www.chattanooga.com/articles_174811.asp



Des Moines Embezzler Claims Multiple Personalities

On September 25, 2009 in Las Vegas, the FBI arrested Phyllis Stevens who was accused of embezzling about \$6 million from the Des Moines insurance company Aviva. The 20-count indictment included money laundering, wire fraud, identity theft and computer fraud in connection with theft. Stevens, who worked for the company for 35 years, is accused of creating a computer program that channeled commission payments into a bank account jointly held by her and a companion.

The case has attracted attention, not only because Stevens was chair of the Iowa branch of Marriage Equality USA, a group dedicated to legal parity for gay and lesbian families, but also because she claims that she is unable to stand trial as a result of suffering from multiple personality disorder.

In May, Phyllis Stevens’ attorney William Kutmus, filed a motion asking that there be a hearing to determine whether she was competent to stand trial that is scheduled for August 16, 2010. According to Kutmus, two psychiatrists, 20 years apart, have diagnosed her with dissociative identity disorder. Kutmus claims: “The stress of a courtroom proceeding may morph defendant Stevens to an altered personality as a method to defend herself. A new personality may surface at any moment in time to replace the old personality.”

Phyllis Stevens is scheduled to stand trial in U.S. District Court with Marla Stevens, her spouse. Marla Stevens is accused of conspiring to launder and spend stolen money and has entered a plea of not guilty according to her attorney Trevor Hook.

Phyllis Stevens was first diagnosed with MPD by an Indianapolis psychiatrist in 1988 and remained in treatment until 1995. The most recent diagnosis is by Des Moines psychiatrist David Drake, D.O. Drake wrote that Phyllis Stevens lives “with an internal world where different parts of her take over different functions and act in ways she is not even aware of.”^[1] “My overarching impression is that Phyllis Stevens underwent severe physical, sexual and emotional abuse in both homes growing up – even to the point of torture.” “She was also raised with the ‘mantra’ of her adoptive mother that to be successful in life, she had to make a lot of money.”

If Phyllis Stevens were found incompetent to stand trial, she would be required to receive treatment and possibly be required to go to trial later when found competent. The prosecution can request that Stevens be evaluated by a psychiatrist of its choice in opposition to the motion.

1. Witosky, T. (2010, May 13). Attorney says Phyllis Stevens, accused Aviva embezzler, has many identities. *DesMoinesRegister.com*. Retrieved on 5/13/10 from <http://www.desmoinesregister.com/fdcp/?1273778096575>

2. Associated Press. (2009, September 28). Officials: Iowan embezzled \$5.9M from Aviva. *KCCI DesMoines* 8. Retrieved on June 5, 2010 from <http://www.kcci.com/news/21140256/detail.html>



“Forgiving does not erase the bitter past. A healed memory is not a deleted memory. Instead, forgiving what we cannot forget creates a new way to remember. We change the memory of our past into a hope for the future.”

Lewis B. Smedes

North Carolina Prosecutors May Appeal Precedent-Setting Decision

North Carolina v M.C.K., # 05 CRS 6148 09CRS 5471, -75, & -76, Moore County Superior Court. Hearing, April 12, 2010.

In May, North Carolina Superior Court Judge John O. Craig III ruled that testimony regarding “repressed” and “recovered” memory was to be excluded from a criminal rape trial. The decision came after a pre-trial hearing that featured contrasting arguments from Dr. Harrison G. Pope, director of the Biological Psychiatry Laboratory at Harvard Medical School’s McLean Hospital and Dr. James A. Chu, Chief of Hospital Clinical Services at McLean Hospital. Pope argued that the notion of repressing and later recovering memories in response to trauma is not a part of established science. Chu acknowledged that there is a controversy but supported the idea that recovered memory exists. According to a report in *The Pilot*, Chu “said that there is no way to tell, in therapy, whether something a patient says is factually true or an unconscious mechanism.”^[1]

The case began when a young woman in her late teens began to have fainting spells and panic attacks and entered therapy with therapist Liz Watson at Moore Regional Hospital’s Behavioral Health Services. According to documents in the case, during therapy the girl mentioned an incident of falling in the bathtub at her father’s house, of being hurt, and of her mother taking her to the emergency ward. The patient and therapist then “talked about how the mind will often protect one by going somewhere else when something very difficult or painful might be happening.” At the next session the girl reported that she had suddenly remembered that her father had lifted her from the bathtub and thrown her against the wall and raped her.

In North Carolina, testimony about repressed and recovered memories of childhood sexual cannot be admitted unless it is accompanied by expert testimony on the subject of memory repression. The defense attorneys filed a motion to suppress that testimony. (*Barrett v. Hyldburg*, ’98)

Some comments from Judge Craig’s decision as reported by John Chappell in *The Pilot*.^[1]

“I kept thinking back to one remark that Dr. Chu made during his direct testimony. He said that this is an unconscious defense mechanism that repressed bad or traumatic memories, and he described it as being Freudian. And then he sort of parenthetically said you cannot disprove a Freudian mechanism. I think the converse is also true. It’s very difficult to prove a Freudian mechanism.”

“Let’s assume that we do call it in this instance an estab-

lished scientific theory, if for no other reason than because it’s been around for a while, and it’s certainly been thoroughly discussed. And it’s been criticized. Everyone is in agreement that it’s controversial. Does that make it established? Well, I don’t know. But let’s assume just for the sake of going through this analysis that we can call it an established scientific theory.”

“Dr. Chu would be limited to giving an explanation to the jury that it was possible for the victim to have been experiencing a repressed memory or dissociative amnesia phenomenon so that the jury could evaluate the reliability of her testimony and decide whether she was telling the truth. And I think...this is a very narrow and limited opinion that Doctor Chu could give.”

“There is the reliability of the therapist who is taking down the notes and whether the therapist has been too suggestive, has asked leading questions, hasn’t asked the right questions, how much training and experience does the therapist have, and so you’ve got that to contend with. And then finally you can overlay another problem, and that is other possible explanations for the behavior on the part of the— victim patient, such as pseudo-memory – some possible underlying agenda that has nothing to do with the repressed memory, but actually turns out to be something entirely different... distorted memory, confabulation, pseudo memory and self-suggestion that would be emerging from the patient’s internal mental workings.”

“It just runs the risk of confusing the jury or causing undue prejudice. And that’s really what it comes down to.”

Attorneys for the State of North Carolina, Laura Parker and Amber Barwick, said that they would appeal the decision. If Craig’s decision is upheld, it would effectively deny admission of any recovered memory testimony in North Carolina in criminal cases. Both sides agree that Craig’s ruling is a precedent affecting all cases of this kind in the state of North Carolina

Defense attorneys are Patrick Mincey and Eddie Meacham of Van Camp, Meacham & Newman in Pinehurst, NC.

1. Chappell, J. (2010, May 16). Ruling in Carthage rape case makes new law. *The Pilot*. Retrieved on 5/16/10 from

<http://www.thepilot.com/news/2010/may/16/ruling-in-carthage-rape-case-makes-new-law/>

Chappell, J. (2010, May 20). State appeals precedent-setting ruling in rape case. *The Pilot*. Retrieved on 5/20/10 from

<http://www.thepilot.com/news/2010/may/20/state-appeals-precedent-setting-ruling-rape-case/>

Barrett v Hyldburg 94-CVS-793 (NC 1998) [on remand from the North Carolina Court of Appeals 487 S.E.2nd 803 (NC 1997)] “There has been no general acceptance in the relevant scientific community of the theory of repressed memory.”



Join retractor, Jeanette Bartha on her new Facebook page: *Multiple Personalities Don't Exist*: A worldwide forum for discussions, information sharing, and breaking news.

Repressed Memory Does Not Toll Statute of Limitations in Ohio Case

2009-0953. Pratte v. Stewart, Slip Opinion No. 2010-Ohio-1860. Greene App. No. 08-CA-95, 2009-Ohio-1768. Judgment of the court of appeals affirmed. <http://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/rod/docs/pdf/0/2010/2010-Ohio-1860.pdf>

The Ohio Supreme Court ruled that a 33-year-old woman could not bring a lawsuit for alleged childhood sexual abuse because the statute of limitations had passed. In 2006, Ohio passed a law that stated that there is a 12-year statute of limitations for bringing claims. The 12-year period begins when a person turns 18.

On April 14, 2008, 33-year-old Amy Pratte filed a civil suit claiming damages from Rodney Stewart for alleged sexual abuse she experienced as a child. In the complaint, she alleged that she had unconsciously repressed the memories throughout her childhood until she saw a news story on April 20, 2007 that caused her to remember. The court denied her suit and she appealed to the Ohio Supreme Court arguing that the statute of limitations should begin when a person recovers repressed memories.

The Supreme Court upheld the trial court. The Court noted that the only exception to the statute of limitations is when the defendant fraudulently conceals facts from the plaintiff. The Court noted the legislature could have included a tolling provision for repressed memory, but it chose not to do so when it wrote the law.

The Court did not rule on the scientific reliability of recovered memories. Indeed, the Court seems to accept repressed memories stating: "We are cognizant of the proposition that some victims of childhood sexual abuse may not recover their memories of the abuse prior to the expiration of the 12-year statute of limitations, and we are not without compassion for those victims."

□

Update: Governor Signs Arizona Bill to Tighten Expert Testimony Standards in Civil Cases

<http://www.azleg.gov/legtext/49leg/2r/laws/0302.htm>

On May 10, 2010, the Governor of Arizona signed a bill that will tighten the standards for expert testimony in civil cases. The Arizona Senate had approved the bill in March in a 20-8 decision and House approval followed.^[1] The bill brings Arizona's legal system into line with evidence standards used in federal courts and most state courts.

This change replaces the decade-old 2000 Arizona Supreme Court decision in Logerquist v. Danforth in which the Court ruled on the evidence issue involving admission of testimony of a plaintiff's claim of repressed memory of alleged sexual abuse during her childhood. (See Background of Logerquist) In a controversial split-decision, that Court held that rules regarding scientific evidence simply do not apply to something as unscientific as repressed memory. The majority voiced confidence that jurors would be able to adequately sift through the reliability of testimony by expert witnesses "as least as right as the trial judge."

The Court held in 2000 that the Frye standard^[2] for expert testimony would hold in Arizona. The Frye standard defines something to be scientific if it has gained "general acceptance." The new law changes the standard to Daubert^[3] in which evidence must be based on facts or data, reliable principles and methods, and witnesses who apply principles and methods reliably.

Long-time readers of the FMSF Newsletter may recall the many articles about the Logerquist v. Danforth case because it was one of the few pre-trial hearings on scientific evidence that did not result in a more scientific approach. Business groups say the change to a standard based on Daubert will weed out frivolous lawsuits.

Opponents say the change undermines the right to jury trial by having judges take on a fact-finding role now performed by jurors.

1. Logerquist v. Danforth, CV 98-0587-PR Az Sup. Ct. April 2000.
2. Frye v. United States, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923).
3. Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993), Davenport, p. (2010, March 3). Senate votes to tighten evidence standard. *AZCapitolTimes.com*. Retrieved on 5/20/10 from <http://azcapitoltimes.com/blog/2010/03/03/senate-votes-to-tighten-evidence-standard/>

Background of Logerquist

Reprinted from FMSF Newsletter Vol. 9 No. 3 (May/June 2000)
Arizona Supreme Court Allows Claims for "Repressed" Memories
Logerquist v. Danforth, CV 98-0587-PR Az Sup. Ct. Apr. 2000

In a 3-2 split-decision that allowed expert testimony on repressed memory, the Arizona Supreme Court on April 19, 2000 took the position that rules regarding scientific evidence simply do not apply to something as unscientific as repressed memory.

The majority quoted with approval: "[R]epressed memory remains woefully short of being empirically verified and, indeed, heralds from a non-rigorous school of psychology in which empirical validation is not a core tenet" and "Repression, in short, is a testable hypothesis, but it has not yet been appropriately tested. Pending satisfactory studies, therefore, the most reasonable scientific position is to maintain skepticism." Given this, they concluded, "[W]e believe the jury must decide what to do about the lack of empirical support."

In 1992 a woman brought suit against her former pediatrician John T. Danforth claiming she had been sexually molested on several occasions from 1971 to 73 when she was between eight and ten years old. The woman claimed her memories were restored in 1991 after watching a television com-

mercial with a pediatrician. The woman sought to have experts who would testify how memories can be repressed because of severe childhood trauma and how the memories can be recalled later with accuracy. The trial judge refused to let her experts testify, ruling that repressed memories “are not generally accepted in the relevant scientific community.” The woman appealed.

Justice Stanley Feldman, who wrote the majority ruling said that the minority justices fear that this would open the door to anyone declaring himself or herself an expert in any theory of human behavior, “however far-fetched,” was overblown. He wrote: “It is apparent we are not dealing with an alchemist attempting to change lead into gold or an astrologer predicting events from the movements of the stars.” He also wrote that it is illogical to assume that judges “will be more able than jurors to tell good science from junk, true scientists from charlatans, truthful experts from liars and venal from objective experts.”

In a dissent, Justice Frederick J. Martone wrote: “The hearing [by the trial judge] was comprehensive and the majority does not take issue with his conclusion that repressed memory is simply not generally accepted in the scientific community... If, as the majority asserts, repressed memory has no scientific basis, then like astrology, expert testimony should be excluded... There may be no area of contemporary psychiatry and psychology more controversial than the theory of repressed memory... Repressed memory does not lie within the range of common knowledge. Experts in psychology and psychiatry cannot reach agreement about its validity. And, if experts cannot agree about the validity of repressed memory, how do we pass this question to the jury with out first reviewing its reliability under some heightened form of evidentiary scrutiny?”

In a second dissent, Justice Ruth V.

McGregor agreed with Justice Martone and added: “I am concerned about the tendency of the decision to isolate Arizona’s courts from the mainstream of judicial analysis ... Arizona now falls within a tiny minority of jurisdictions that have chosen to adopt a unique interpretation... I see two significant negative results. First, evidentiary rulings that could significantly affect the outcome of litigation will differ depending upon whether an action proceeds in state or in federal court... Second, because our approach diverges from that taken in most jurisdictions, Arizona’s courts will lose the advantage of being able to learn from and follow the reasoning of other courts...we lose the flexibility needed to admit evidence based upon reliable, but newly-developed, scientific principles.”

See *FMSF Newsletter* September 1999 Vol. 8 No. 6, Legal Corner,

“Commentary: Revival of Memory: A Fact Question for the Jury (*Bertram v. Poole*, 1999 Minn. App. LEXIS 851)

See *FMSF Newsletter* June 1998 Vol. 7 No. 5 “Arizona Supreme Court Holds That Discovery Rule Applies to Repressed Memory Claim” for comments on the thinking of the court in another repressed memory case.

Arizona Star, 4/20/00, “Arizona high court allows for claims of ‘repressed’ memories of abuse,” Howard Fischer.



The Rutherford Family Speaks to FMS Families

The DVD made by the Rutherford family is *the* most popular DVD of FMSF families. It covers the complete story from accusation, to retraction and reconciliation. Family members describe the things they did to cope and to help reunite. Of particular interest are Beth Rutherford’s comments about what her family did that helped her to retract and return.

Available in DVD format only:

To order send request to

FMSF -DVD, 1955 Locust St.

Philadelphia, PA 19103

\$10.00 per DVD; Canada add \$4.00; other countries add \$10.00

Checks payable to FMS Foundation

F R O M O U R

R E A D E R S

We Are Back Together: That’s What Counts

I want to thank the FMS Foundation for giving me the courage and hope to get through 17 years of alienation from my daughter and my three grandsons.

My daughter suddenly returned in January when we both attended my son’s and her brother’s 50th birthday party. We sat together and talked and talked for hours, but not one word about the long time of separation or the reason for it.

After three subsequent dinners with her, a date was set for me to meet my grandsons for the first time. What a great experience we had getting acquainted. There certainly was a lot of time to make up! At dinner that night, my daughter apologized to her three sons for not allowing them to have a relationship with their grandfather.

My daughter and I are now closer than ever. The years of anxiety ended as abruptly as they began with no reason for the break up and no reason for the return. Frankly, at this point, I no longer care about the reasons, although my curiosity had the best of me during the time of separation. We are back together, and that is what counts.

I can truly tell FMSF members who are walking in my shoes to “hang in” there. Keep hoping, keep praying, and keep supporting the FMS Foundation. Some day, hopefully, you too will walk together with the person who long ago broke the family stride.

Thank the Good Lord that the FMS Foundation was there, walking with me along the dreadful road through the wilderness of separation and helping me to have the strength to reach the finish line of “Return.”

Appreciatively yours,
A very happy father



Clearing My Name

FMSF provided information to me in my legal case many years ago. I'm writing because recently there have been some twists and turns. I don't know what I need to do with the new information I have.

Approximately 15 years ago I was convicted of two counts of felonious sexual assault in Dover, NH, Strafford County Superior court. The case was a controversial repressed memory case. I was represented by the Public Defender's office and, in my opinion, it was a less than stellar defense counsel performance. Since the conviction, my life has been extremely difficult, as I have constantly tried to overcome the backlash that accompanies sexual assault convictions. Not a day has gone by that I did not think of the case, the trial, and what my life might have been had this nightmare never occurred.

I have always maintained my innocence and stand by it today. The victim in the case was my niece who was 14-years-old at the time of the trial. The alleged abuse supposedly happened when she was three-years-old. This niece recently found and contacted me on Facebook. She was apologetic for ruining my life, and she also wrote that the case haunted her on a daily basis because she had put the wrong man in jail. She asked that I not hate her and that I find it in my heart to forgive her. Though I was skeptical, I responded with a short message stating I did not hate her, and I wished her no ill will; however, if she cared to share the facts about the case that never were heard in court, it would help me get on with my life.

Then my niece told me about how the accusations unfolded, starting when she was eight-years-old. She wrote about how confused she was then. She said that she was questioned about her abuser for months before the trial. She said that when she went to court that she hated it. She didn't want them to say the things they did about

me and my family. She wrote that she was scared and couldn't just say to the police that they had the wrong guy. She said that she was told once again to shut her mouth, [that] someone was going to pay for hurting her. She said that she wasn't strong enough to say anything then! She told me that she was so sorry she ruined my life! OUR lives!

After the conviction she had to live with what happened, which must have been difficult for her. She wrote that every day that went by she wanted to tell someone that the wrong man was convicted. But, she told me, she had no idea of who to tell. She said that she shut down. She hoped that if she had her own family she could forget it all. She said, however, that she couldn't.

My niece wrote that recently her mother, who had believed that I was the one who had abused her daughter, had started seeing a medium. The medium told the mother the identity of the abuser. It was not me, according to the medium. Now my niece's mother also believes I'm innocent.

My niece wrote that she was angry about this because her mother had not listened to her earlier. She said that the mother told her that what was done was done and that my niece would go to jail for lying in court. My niece ended by saying that she appreciated our correspondence and that she felt that I was the only person who has discussed the case without judging her.

She said that she had taken a chance writing to me and that she felt good about it. My niece said that she hoped we could continue to figure things out and that I would be able to make the connections I needed. She wrote that maybe someday she would be able to face my family and ask for forgiveness.

I am obviously floored and confused. I have no idea where to turn or what to do. I'm not sure who to consult or who to trust. I do know I need advice. I would appreciate any direc-

tion or insight you could offer.

Robert
(Robert has consulted an attorney in New Hampshire and hopes to clear his name.)

□

The Most Difficult Time of My Life

My family is part of the False Memory Syndrome Foundation, and has a story very, very similar to yours. A couple years ago my oldest sister was diagnosed with False Memory Syndrome, after she made allegations against my father that she "remembered" while undergoing therapy with our family therapist. At the time, my family completely split apart. I was a teenager who knew nothing about FMS. I was very close to my oldest sister and I believed her accusations. But my other sister did not. It was only after my accusing sister stopped seeing our family therapist that she recanted. After a very painful healing process, my family eventually reunited. I realize that we were one of the rare lucky families, since not all families get back together after such extreme accusations.

Even though the accusations and reconciliation happened several years ago, the effect of it all was unquestionably the most difficult time in my life. The experience has stayed with me and even as I've grown to adulthood, I remain passionate about this problem. I recognize that it is potentially a very controversial subject, but I am dedicated to raising awareness about it in hopes that it will help save other families for going through what we had to endure.

I would like to be in contact with other people in the Santa Monica area who also want to raise awareness.

You may contact me (Kate Holupka) in Santa Monica, CA by phone at 330-842-2494, or by email atkt21369@yahoo.com.

□

Web Sites of Interest

www.seweb.uci.edu/faculty/loftus/

Elizabeth Loftus

www.theisticsatanism.com/asp/

Against Satanic Panics

comp.uark.edu/~lampinen/lab.html

The Lampinen Lab False Memory Reading Group,
University of Arkansas

<http://www.exploratorium.edu/memory/>

The Exploratorium Memory Exhibit

theretractor.angelfire.com/

Site for retractors run by Laura Pasley

www.process.org/

Site of Investigative Journalist

www.psyfmfrance.fr

French False Memory Group

www.psychoheresy-aware.org/ministry.html

The Bobgans question Christian counseling

<http://www.IllinoisFMS.org>

Illinois-Wisconsin FMS Society

www.ltech.net/OHIOarmhp

Ohio Group

recoveredmemorytherapy.blogspot.com

Matt Stone's updates on Australia FMS

<http://www.bfms.org.uk>

British False Memory Society

www.religioustolerance.org/sra.htm

Information about Satanic Ritual Abuse

www.angryparents.net

Parents Against Cruel Therapy

www.peterellis.org.nz

Site run by Brian Robinson contains information
about Christchurch Creche and other cases.

www.falseallegation.org

National Child Abuse
Defense & Resource Center

www.markpendergrast.com

Excerpts from *Victims of Memory*

www.rickross.com/groups/fsm.html

Ross Institute

www.enigma.se/info/FFI.htm

FMS in Scandinavia - Janet Hagbom

www.ncrj.org/

National Center for Reason & Justice

www.traumaversterking.nl

English language web site of Dutch retractor.

www.quackwatch.org

This site is run by Stephen Barrett, M.D.

www.stopbadtherapy.com

Contains information about filing complaints.

F M S F

BULLETIN BOARD

CONTACTS & MEETINGS - UNITED STATES

ALABAMA

See Georgia

ALASKA

Kathleen 907-333-5248

ARIZONA

Phoenix Pat 480-396-9420

ARKANSAS

Little Rock Al & Lela 870-363-4368

CALIFORNIA

Sacramento Jocelyn 530-570-1862

San Francisco & North Bay

Charles 415-435-9618

San Francisco & South Bay

Eric 408-738-0469

East Bay Area Judy 925-952-4853

Central Orange County

Chris & Alan 949-733-2925

Covina Area

Floyd & Libby 626-357-2750

COLORADO

Colorado Springs Doris 719-488-9738

FLORIDA

Central Florida - Please call for mtg. time

John & Nancy 352-750-5446

GEORGIA

Atlanta

Wallie & Jill 770-971-8917

ILLINOIS

Chicago & Suburbs - 1st Sun. (MO)

Eileen 847-985-7693 or

Liz 847-827-1056

INDIANA

Indiana Assn. for Responsible Mental Health
Practices

Pat 317-865-8913 & Helen 574-753-2779

KANSAS

Wichita - Meeting as called

Pat 785-762-2825

LOUISIANA

Sarah 337-235-7656

MAINE

Portland - 4th Sun. (MO)

Bobby 207-878-9812

MARYLAND

Carol 410-465-6555

MASSACHUSETTS/NEW ENGLAND

Andover - 2nd Sun. (MO) @ 1pm

Frank 978-263-9795

MICHIGAN

Greater Detroit Area Nancy 248-642-8077

MINNESOTA

Terry & Collette 507-642-3630

Dan & Joan 651-631-2247

MISSOURI

Springfield - Quarterly (4th Sat. of Apr.,

Jul., Oct., Jan.) @12:30pm

Tom 417-753-4878 & Roxie 417-781-2058

MONTANA

Lee & Avone 406-443-3189

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Jean 603-772-2269 & Mark 802-872-0847

NEW JERSEY

Sally 609-927-4147 (Southern)

NEW MEXICO

Albuquerque - 2nd Sat. (BI-MO) @1 pm

Southwest Room -Presbyterian Hospital

Maggie 505-662-7521(after 6:30pm) or Sy

505-758-0726

NEW YORK

Upstate/Albany Area

Elaine 518-399-5749

NORTH CAROLINA

Susan 704-538-7202

OHIO

Cleveland

Bob & Carole 440-356-4544

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma City

Dee 405-942-0531

OREGON

Portland area

Kathy 503-655-1587

PENNSYLVANIA

Wayne (includes S. NJ)

Jim & Jo 610-783-0396

TEXAS

Houston

Jo or Beverly 713-464-8970

UTAH

Keith 801-467-0669

WASHINGTON

See Oregon

WISCONSIN

Katie & Leo 414-476-0285 or

Susanne & John 608-427-3686

INTERNATIONAL

BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA

Vancouver & Mainland

Lloyd 250-741-8941

Victoria & Vancouver Island

John 250-721-3219

MANITOBA CANADA

Roma 204-275-5723

ONTARIO, CANADA

London

Adriaan 519-471-6338

Ottawa

Eileen 613-836-3294

Burlington

Ken & Marina 905-637-6030

Waubaushe

Paula 705-543-0318

QUEBEC

Claudine: Claudisyl@hotmail.com

514-620-6397 French and English

AUSTRALIA

Evelyn everei@adam.com.au

BELGIUM

werkgr.fict.herinneringen@altavista.net

FRANCE

afsi.fauxsouvenirs@wabadii.fr

ISRAEL

FMS ASSOCIATION fax-972-2-625-9282

NEW ZEALAND

Colleen 09-416-7443

SWEDEN

Ake Moller FAX 48-431-217-90

UNITED KINGDOM

The British False Memory Society

Madeline 44-1225 868-682



Copyright © 2010 by the FMS Foundation

1955 Locust Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-5766
Phone: 215-940-1040 Fax: 215-940-1042
mail@FMSFonline.org www.FMSFonline.org
ISSN # 1069-0484
Pamela Freyd, Ph.D., Executive Director

FMSF Scientific and Professional Advisory Board

July 1, 2010

Aaron T. Beck, M.D., D.M.S., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Terence W. Campbell, Ph.D.**, Clinical and Forensic Psychology, Sterling Heights, MI; **Rosalind Cartwright, Ph.D.**, Rush Presbyterian St. Lukes Medical Center, Chicago, IL; **Jean Chapman, Ph.D.**, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI; **Loren Chapman, Ph.D.**, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI; **Frederick C. Crews, Ph.D.**, University of California, Berkeley, CA; **Robyn M. Dawes, Ph.D.**, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA; **David F. Dinges, Ph.D.**, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Henry C. Ellis, Ph.D.**, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM; **Fred H. Frankel, MBChB, DPM**, Harvard University Medical School; **George K. Ganaway, M.D.**, Emory University of Medicine, Atlanta, GA; **Rochel Gelman, Ph.D.**, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ; **Henry Gleitman, Ph.D.**, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Lila Gleitman, Ph.D.**, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Richard Green, M.D., J.D.**, Charing Cross Hospital, London; **John Hochman, M.D.**, UCLA Medical School, Los Angeles, CA; **David S. Holmes, Ph.D.**, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS; MA; **Robert A. Karlin, Ph.D.**, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ; **Elizabeth Loftus, Ph.D.**, University of California, Irvine, CA; **Susan L. McElroy, M.D.**, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH; **Paul McHugh, M.D.**, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD; **Harold Merskey, D.M.**, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada; **Spencer Harris Morfit**, Author, Westford, MA; **Ulric Neisser, Ph.D.**, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY; **Richard Ofshe, Ph.D.**, University of California, Berkeley, CA; **Emily Carota Orne, B.A.**, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Loren Pankratz, Ph.D.**, Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland, OR; **Michael A. Persinger, Ph.D.**, Laurentian University, Ontario, Canada; **August T. Piper, Jr., M.D.**, Seattle, WA; **Harrison Pope, Jr., M.D.**, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA; **James Randi**, Author and Magician, Plantation, FL; **Henry L. Roediger, III, Ph.D.**, Washington University, St. Louis, MO; **Carolyn Saari, Ph.D.**, Loyola University, Chicago, IL; **Michael A. Simpson, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., M.R.C., D.O.M.**, Center for Psychosocial & Traumatic Stress, Pretoria, South Africa; **Ralph Slovenko, J.D., Ph.D.**, Wayne State University Law School, Detroit, MI; **Jeffrey Victor, Ph.D.**, Jamestown Community College, Jamestown, NY; **Hollida Wakefield, M.A.**, Institute of Psychological Therapies, Northfield, MN; **Charles A. Weaver, III, Ph.D.**, Baylor University, Waco, TX.

Advisors to whom we are grateful who are now deceased.

Martin Gardner, Author, Norman, OK; **David A. Halperin, M.D.**, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, NY; **Ernest Hilgard, Ph.D.**, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA; **Philip S. Holzman, Ph.D.**, Harvard University, Cambridge; **Harold Lief, M.D.**, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Martin Orne, M.D., Ph.D.**, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Campbell Perry, Ph.D.**, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada; **Theodore Sarbin, Ph.D.**, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA; **Thomas A. Sebeok, Ph.D.**, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN; **Margaret Singer, Ph.D.**, University of California, Berkeley, CA; **Donald Spence, Ph.D.**, Robert Wood Johnson Medical Center, Piscataway, NJ.

Do you have access to e-mail? Send a message to

pjff@cis.upenn.edu

if you wish to receive electronic versions of this newsletter and notices of radio and television broadcasts about FMS. All the message need say is "add to the FMS-News". It would be useful, but not necessary, if you add your full name (all addresses and names will remain strictly confidential).

The False Memory Syndrome Foundation is a qualified 501(c)3 corporation with its principal offices in Philadelphia and governed by its Board of Directors. While it encourages participation by its members in its activities, it must be understood that the Foundation has no affiliates and that no other organization or person is authorized to speak for the Foundation without the prior written approval of the Executive Director. All membership dues and contributions to the Foundation must be forwarded to the Foundation for its disposition.

The FMSF Newsletter will be published 4 times in 2010 by the False Memory Syndrome Foundation. The newsletter is delivered electronically and it is also available on the FMSF website: www.FMSFonline.org Those without access to the Internet should contact the Foundation.

Your Contribution Will Help

PLEASE FILL OUT ALL INFORMATION
PLEASE PRINT

__ Visa: Card # & exp. date: _____

__ Discover: Card # & exp. date: _____

__ Mastercard: # & exp. date: _____

(Minimum credit card is \$25)

__ Check or Money Order: **Payable to FMS Foundation in U.S. dollars**

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

State, ZIP (+4) _____

Country: _____

Phone: (_____) _____

Fax: (_____) _____

Thank you for your generosity.