Dear Friends,

Wouldn’t it be interesting if there were a “cease fire” in the memory wars for the summer? But the debate rages on relentlessly, slowly bringing greater clarity to the issues.

Arguments about whether significant trauma enhances or hinders memory may be resolved. A new study (page 3) powerfully demonstrates that great trauma seriously interferes with memory. Charles Morgan studied over 500 soldiers, sailors and pilots at military survival schools who were being trained to withstand the mental and physical stresses of capture. They were subjected to intense interrogations after 48 hours without food or sleep. Half of them were physically threatened and showed signs of intense physiological stress. After 24 hours, only 30 percent could identify the interrogators in a line up and 30 individuals even got the gender wrong. The participants who were threatened had the poorest recognition. The study casts great doubt on the reliability of all victim testimonies in cases involving psychological trauma and will likely be highly influential in legal cases.

In recent months, a number of professionals have contacted the Foundation for help in understanding the significance of the studies by Michael Anderson and colleagues in 2001[2] and 2004[3]. (See FMSF newsletters Vol. 10(3) and Vol. 13(2).) Has a repression mechanism actually been found, they asked. We were especially pleased to note, therefore, a paper by Garry and Loftus in the May Skeptical Inquirer that discusses just this question.[4] On page 3, there is a short description of the paper, enough, we think, to show that the claims about repression in the Anderson papers go far beyond what the data actually show.

FMSF Advisor Spencer Harris Morfit has written an essay about personal responsibility (page 5) with which some readers may disagree and, we hope, respond. One point Morfit makes is all too accurate: There is lack of oversight of psychotherapy. Morfit uses the case of Bennett Braun, M.D. as an example, but other examples abound.

Last year in the September/October issue we wrote about the fact that New Jersey had permanently revoked the license of social worker Dorothy Neddermeyer and ordered her not to offer services on her web site. As of May 19, 2004, Neddermeyer’s web site lists 9 office locations for the company of which she is the executive director, and she continues to invite readers to partake of regression therapy to find their memories.[*] Another web site tells readers that Brandon Bays cured her cancer by finding the “old emotional patterns and memories stored in her cells” and then letting “healing energy resolve and clear the old issues.” She invites readers to attend seminars to learn how to do this. Caveat emptor—buyer beware.

Over the years, the FMSF Newsletters have often included information about day-care cases such as the Kelly Michaels and the Amirault cases, or about other situations involving young children, such as Wenatchee, (where the notion of recovered repressed memories was not primarily involved). This Newsletter issue is unusual, however, because there is so much about child cases. As time has...
passed, claims about recovery of memories have moved to younger and younger children. For example, it is not unusual for us to get phone calls about 8-year-olds remembering abuse from age 4 years.

The FMS Foundation is not changing its mission or focus, but readers should be aware that accusations involving young children seem not to have slowed down, especially in divorce and custody cases.

The National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect Information recently released 2002 data about child abuse. On page 4 are a few of those statistics and a commentary on them by Howard Fishman. Fishman informs us that Department of Health and Human Services has reviewed each state’s child and family services programs and found widespread problems in child welfare programs intended to protect children from abuse and neglect. Indeed, no state received even a passing grade. His comments provide a context to the release of John Stoll (page 9) in the Legal Corner.

The frustration that so many readers feel about too many psychotherapists not held accountable for harm that was avoidable is mirrored in the child cases. In the Stoll case, for example, a report by the California Attorney General’s office in 1986 (18 years before his release) concluded that local authorities had used “suggestive” questioning that led children to give answers that authorities wanted. In the Amirault case (page 10), the child interviewer Susan J. Kelley is now Dean of the College of Health and Human Services at Georgia State University and has apparently continued to cling to her beliefs about ritual abuse at least through 1996. The prosecutors in the Stoll case and the child interviewer in the Amirault case went on to success while John Stoll and Gerald Amirault are just now learning how to deal with cell phones and malls.

Where is the public outrage that so many miscarriages of justice have been allowed to take place in both the child cases and the recovered memory cases? Where is the outrage that should exist after a government report finds that no state is doing a good job with child welfare? That is one of the most puzzling aspects of the current climate.

*Information about Neddermeyer corrected on 9/1/04 on web.*


We are especially pleased to let you know that the paper “From Refusal to Reconciliation: Family Relationships After an Accusation Based on Recovered Memories” by Paul McHugh, Harold Lief, Pamela Freyd and Janet Fetkewicz, will appear in the August 2004 issue of the *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease.*

This paper is based on family responses to the FMSF survey two years ago. If you would like a copy, please send a self-addressed and stamped standard size envelope to the Foundation office.

“Usurp someone’s memory, and he’ll grow a new narrative over time, one that thrives in his belief system. What began as a lie gains status as a memorable truth.”


When the media passes along doubtful information, it runs a risk of not only misinforming, but of starting things truly harmful. Junk psychology is a prime example.

In 1973, a bestseller told the story of multiple personalities. It was titled *Sybil,* and it took years to reveal that the whole thing was a fraud. Meanwhile, many who bought into it were psychologists and they produced a blizzard of books on the subject, reporting patients with dozens of personalities in one host, creating problems and doing evil the patient wasn’t responsible for. Many of the books were bestsellers.

This led to false memory syndrome, recovered memories that during the “great sex panic” of the ‘80s sent dozens of people, mainly dads, to jail for sex crimes against their children that never happened. As adults, the children experienced recovered memories while in therapy. Families were torn apart. Dozens of others went to jail for ritual sex abuse of children, through evidence downloaded by psychologists. The whole frenzy was fed by the media, including movies and trash television.

It got sorted out and there are still lawsuits in the mix, but only now is the question coming up: What is the responsibility of the professional associations that are supposed to police the psychology field? What is the responsibility of courts that bought into it? How is it that despite such a track record, psychologists still shop the courts for work, and are accepted as experts?


special thanks
We extend a very special “Thank you” to all of the people who help prepare the FMSF Newsletter. *Editorial Support:* Janet Fetkewicz, Howard Fishman, Peter Freyd, Members of the FMSF Scientific Advisory Board and Members who wish to remain anonymous. *Letters and Information:* Our Readers.
Repression Mechanism Found? Maybe Not
I am Freud’s brain.

In 2001 Michael Anderson and Collin Green published the results of a study in which they asked participants not to think about certain target words (i.e. to suppress the words). The question was whether participants would, when tested later, be less likely to remember word pairs that they were asked to suppress compared with a baseline measure. Anderson and Green concluded that their results “support a suppression mechanism that pushes unwanted memories out of awareness, as posited by Freud.” (Anderson and Green, 2001, p. 368). In 2004, Anderson et al. published another article

3. The Anderson studies tell us about memories for mundane words, not traumatic events. Daniel Schacter questioned what Anderson’s experiment shows about repression. He noted that a hallmark of Freudian notions of repression is that people push distressing, threatening, personal information out of awareness, not mundane irrelevancies. (Schacter, 2001)

4. In an interview with the New York Times, Larry Squire cautioned that Anderson et al.’s neuroimaging results could be interpreted in an entirely different way—that they could reflect the fact that subjects were directing their attention elsewhere. (O’Connor, 2004)

5. Anderson and colleagues have now twice claimed to have found that the suppression instruction causes poorer memory performance. However, John Bulevich, Henry Roediger and David Balota have twice replicated the experiment and they have failed to find any such effect (Bulevich, Roediger, and Balota, 2003). That is not to say there is no suppression effect, but it does mean that it might be rather fragile. Fragile suppression has little resemblance to robust repression.


Extreme Stress Limits Memory

Many studies have questioned the accuracy of memory for traumatic events, but often that research has been dismissed as being too far removed from real-life trauma. Other studies have argued that intense personal trauma results in better memories. This study shows that highly stressful situations greatly impair the accuracy of memory. The results appear to finally settle the argument.

Charles A. Morgan, III, studied over 500 soldiers, sailors and pilots at military survival schools. The subjects were being trained to withstand the mental and physical stresses of capture. They were subjected to intense interrogations after 48 hours without food or sleep. Half of them were physically threatened and they showed signs of intense physiological stress.

A day after release from the camp the participants were asked to identify their interrogators. Only 30 per cent could find the right person in a line-up and 49 percent from sequential photos. Clothing cues boosted the correct identification to 66 per cent. Thirty people got the gender wrong and the participants who had been subjected to physical threats were the worst at recognizing their interrogators.

The author comments that since this study used highly trained and selective subjects, the generally population might be even lower. The author notes that “these data raise the possibility that other types of stress-induced memory deficits (such as narrative memory) may also exist in healthy individuals.”

This study casts significant doubt on the reliability of all victim testimonies in cases involving psychological trauma.
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Readers of the FMSF Newsletter will not be surprised to learn that the data regarding child maltreatment (see article in this issue) need to be parsed carefully. They are revealing both in terms of what is included and what is omitted. Just a few of the most obvious questions raised by these statistics [1] will be discussed.

It is reported that there were 2.6 million “referrals” to child welfare officials in 2002. Not mentioned is the fact that this number reflects a decrease of 500,000 reports compared with the 1997 data. We are not told the reasons for this change.

What has not changed is the evidence of rampant child abuse hysteria. In 2002—as in 1997—about 70% of all reports were not deemed worthy of investigation or were determined to be “unfounded” or “unsubstantiated.” In pragmatic terms, what this means is that two million innocent families were falsely accused in 2002. The emotional and financial costs of these “erroneous” reports are ignored. Also unmentioned is the fact that despite laws sanctioning false reporting, such prosecutions almost never occur.

The report notes that “an estimated 896,000 children were determined to be victims of child abuse or neglect in 2002.” Seventy percent of these children (about half a million) were “victims” of neglect. There is no acknowledgement that “neglect” typically means nothing more than “poverty” and that a significant majority of these children suffer no inflicted harm. Rather than providing needy families with appropriate social services, the current system seems to prefer removing children in order to justify an extensive foster care program.

Several critically important facts may help us better understand the data and the current state of child protection:

1. Federal authorities continue to fail to segregate cases involving children who are abused or neglected while under state supervision or in state care. Several hundred children in these categories die every year, but it is difficult to obtain hard facts because state officials hide behind confidentiality laws. There is no question, however, that children in state care are at significantly increased risk of severe physical injury, molestation, and death.

2. Between forty and sixty percent (depending upon jurisdiction) of children killed by their parents or other caregivers were already known to child protection authorities as being “at risk.”

3. The data reported by federal officials fail to include the ultimate outcomes of so-called “founded” cases. Whether pursued through administrative channels, civil proceedings, or criminal trials, approximately one-third to one-half of these cases result in a finding of no culpability by the alleged offender. Thus, we have an “error rate” (or, more pointedly, a false accusation rate) of between 80 and 85 percent.

4. The data regarding child sex abuse are particularly revealing. Contrary to the impression created by the media and the sponsors of many professional conferences, sexual abuse is reported in only 10% of all cases. In fact, of all parents who were reported to be abusers, less than 3 percent were associated with sexual abuse.

5. In many child protection agencies, the turnover rate among caseworkers is in excess of 30% annually. All too often, those who remain may be unfamiliar with the professional literature and the hazards associated with leading, suggestive, manipulative, and coercive questioning. The techniques for implanting memories in children are similar, if not identical, to those employed by “recovered memory therapists.” Another parallel is the belief that certain behaviors and “symptoms” are definitive indicators of sexual abuse, despite the fact that such beliefs have been consistently debunked in the

Excerpts from Child Maltreatment 2002: Key Findings
National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect Information
On the Web at: nccanch.acf.hhs.gov/pubs/factsheets/canstats.cfm

In 2002, an estimated total of 2.6 million referrals concerning the welfare of approximately 4.5 million children were made to CPS agencies throughout the United States. Of these, approximately two-thirds (an estimated 1.8 million) were accepted for investigation or assessment; one-third were not accepted.

An estimated 896,000 children were determined to be victims of child abuse or neglect in 2002. The rate of victimization per 1,000 children in the national population has dropped from 13.4 children in 1990 to 12.3 children in 2002.

Approximately 30 percent of the reports included at least one child who was found to be a victim of abuse or neglect. Sixty-one percent of the reports were found to be unsubstantiated (including intentionally false); the remaining reports were closed for additional reasons.

More than 60 percent of child victims experienced neglect. Almost 20 percent were physically abused; 10 percent were sexually abused and 7 percent were emotionally maltreated. [The rest were associated with “other” types of maltreatment.]

More than 80 percent of perpetrators were parents. Of all parents who were perpetrators, less than 3 percent were associated with sexual abuse. Of all perpetrators of sexual abuse, nearly 29 percent were other relatives, and nearly one-quarter were in nonrelative or nonchildcaring roles.

Commentary On Child Maltreatment Data:
The Numbers Tell the Tale . . . or Do They?
Howard Fishman
Essay on Personal Responsibility
Spencer Harris Morfit

FMSF has done a remarkable job of raising awareness about the “false” or “recovered” memory phenomenon. Arguably, the most significant contribution is a sharp awareness of the role suggestion plays in therapy and how vulnerable to suggestion we are. Many of the efforts of the Foundation (including mine) have been directed towards trying to educate, exhort, regulate or sue therapists into accepting more professional responsibility for the influence they exert over their patients. Though we’ve had our victories, we ruefully note that large pockets of the therapeutic professions have proved extraordinarily recalcitrant, that licensing boards are close to useless, professional associations slow to act (if, indeed, they ever do), and that professional conferences still offer seminars on, for instance, “ritualized Satanic abuse.”

If we want to make more progress still, perhaps we ought to look at the client side of the equation. Specifically, does the client have any responsibility for surrendering all self-sovereignty over something as personal as one’s own memories and history to a therapist? Now please bear with me. I am aware that in asking that question I risk the accusation I am “blaming the victim.” If I recall the fact that, with the exception of pre-school children, over 90% of the false accusations come from women, please don’t heap the coals of “sexism” on my head. I invite you to step back here with me and take a look at our experience from some new angles.

First, let us observe that, with the exception of our own Scientific and Advisory Board and a handful of others—God bless ’em—leadership on any “correction” of the problem has come from outside the clinical professions. Leadership has come from parents organizing to protest false accusations. It has come from lawyers introducing rigor in the courtroom. It’s come from research psychologists who are regularly attacked or ignored by the clinicians, from retractors, from the media, from managed care. Little has come from inside and we are still waiting for in-depth coverage of the “false memory” issues to become universal textbook fare.

Second, no matter how much responsibility we think therapists or regulatory bodies should take, a lot of them don’t. A case in point is that of Dr. Bennett Braun. If Braun isn’t the fountainhead of clinical ideas about “multiple personality disorder” and “Satanic abuse,” then would you buy “poster child?” Yet, despite the facts that:

• Braun and his co-defendants have settled multiple malpractice suits for tens of millions of dollars (including the record $10.6 million dollar settlement for the Burgus family that made the front page of The New York Times)
• They were named as co-conspirators in a criminal trial;
• Nationally televised documentaries have covered their bizarre practices;
• Braun’s license to practice was suspended in Illinois;…

We now learn the State of Montana has issued a “restricted” license to Braun and he still practices in Helena.

If years of going after Braun have not removed this most egregious and visible public menace, then how can we hope to go against every therapist’s faulty theories and misguided techniques? We can’t—any more than we can protect a beloved daughter’s heart by eliminating every cad, roué, or wolf on the planet. Unless we really want to accompany them to every co-ed occasion, we would train our daughters to protect themselves.

Third, let’s take a look at where some of these cases started to turn around. Specifically, let’s look at the well-known and severe cases of two Braun clients, Pat Burgus and Mary
Shanley. These were well-covered in the PBS FRONTLINE documentary called “The Search for Satan” which is my primary source for this. In both instances, the therapists were administering psychotropic drugs, isolating the patients from any contravening opinions, and strapping them down in full restraints. Any rational person would acknowledge this is extreme and abusive treatment, that the therapists failed to meet minimal standards of care as the patients deteriorated under the treatment regimen, that the therapists have responsibility for applying unproven techniques. Still, the therapists didn’t own this responsibility, never have, probably never will.

Even under these extreme conditions, both Pat Burgus and Mary Shanley, by their own statements, started to improve when they stopped believing the “experts” and started making decisions for themselves. Granted, it helped that they were backing off drugs as the treatment reached a conclusion that was suspiciously coincidental to the exhaustion of their insurance benefits. But both Burgus and Shanley were quite clear on this matter in their FRONTLINE interviews. Burgus, with emphasis, says something to this effect: “I started to get better when I stopped believing Dr. Braun.” Shanley says she started to get better when she found a new therapist and she began to go forward. Hmmmmmm! Interesting to note that mental health and taking responsibility for oneself seem to have some correlation here. Though it’s interesting that Mary seemed to need permission to stop.

Burgus and Shanley report other things that are often found in retractor reports. At several points in the therapy, they questioned how therapists could know more about their own histories and “memories” than they did. GOOD question! There were times when they themselves found the “Satanic” explanations bizarre. The question is: If they found those interpretations questionable, why did they repeatedly capitulate to the therapists instead of calling the therapists to account? Some related questions are: 1) Are women more prone to this than men? 2) If so, why?

I’ve heard lots of answers to these questions. Most boil down to the fact that the patients revered the therapists as experts. Some point out that over 90% of therapeutic patients are women, so it’s logical that over 90% of the accusations would come from women. That ignores the question of why women so easily submit themselves to a process that seems to require such self-surrender while men do not. Again, by their own admission, there were times when patients repeatedly questioned the “expertise” and abandoned their own reservations. Why? Did they think they had no right to question unless they had a Ph.D. in philosophy and several credit hours of logic? Is that the other side of the “expert” issue? And, if so, do we need a Ph.D. in political science to vote? Or in nutrition to grocery shop? How about child development to be a parent? Or electrical engineering to replace an outlet? Or a cruise missile to light a cigarette? This question that is so stunning in these cases is: Even allowing for the vagaries of memory, who could POSSIBLY have more authority over your history and your memories than yourself?

The biggest lesson of the “false memory” phenomenon is, “Let the buyer beware.” This isn’t the only venue in which this ancient warning is apt. We learn we cannot blindly entrust our 401Ks to “experts” on Wall Street. Our employers may lie to us. The FDA approves drugs that prove to have fatal side effects and are withdrawn months later. Our government leads us to war looking for weapons of mass destruction. There’s so much conflicting advice about diet and nutrition it has become a joke. It’s just darned dangerous to place unearned trust in anyone, no matter how many credentials they have. There’s a point beyond which waiting for vested interests to self-correct only keeps us entangled and dependent upon them.

If we want to protect ourselves and the women/people we love, then it seems it would be helpful to study this tendency to surrender self-sovereignty in any venue, but perhaps starting in therapy. What are the vulnerabilities? How do we teach people to think for themselves? How do we build skill and self-confidence in their own capacities for self-scrutiny? How do we support them in demanding reasonable explanations for unreasonable statements and holding their ground until they get them—or they walk away? Indeed, is this possibly a straighter path to health?

It would be mistake to think I lack sympathy for the painful separations these false memories have caused. It would be a mistake to think I am not justifiably enraged at what some therapists do in the name of “help.” It would be a mistake to think I underestimate the way therapists may lay siege to “resistances.” The point here is not to blame the victim, but, recognizing all of this, to prevent them from becoming victims in the first place. And the only way I know to do that is to encourage the development of a healthy, skilled
skepticism that is the beginning of wisdom.

I write this on Mother’s Day, partially in loving tribute to my own mother who urged me to think independently (though, if she were alive, she would tell you she sometimes thinks she went overboard.)

Spencer Harris Morfit is an author and business woman. She is a member of the FMSF Professional Advisory Board.

 Recovering from Recovered Memories
Mark Pendergrast

Here is the final installment from Mark Pendergrast’s proposal for a book entitled Recovering from Recovered Memories, following the case study of Betty O’Connor. This ends Chapter 1, “How Could This Have Happened to Me?”

**********

You, the reader, may be in a situation similar to Betty’s, or you may have begun to doubt your memories even more seriously. Regardless, you need to realize that you were a secret, unknowing incest survivor, it becomes very difficult to take it back or to change your mind. Back in 1957, psychologist Leon Festinger wrote a very interesting book called A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. His idea was that your mind simply cannot handle two severely conflicting notions of reality at the same time. Something has to give. When we experience some kind of disequilibrium—when one of our central beliefs is somehow challenged—it results in an internal conflict that Festinger termed “cognitive dissonance.” The more important and dramatic the conflict, the greater the magnitude of the dissonance. When we suffer such massive internal tension, we must come down on one side or the other, or go insane.

Certainly, there could be no greater cognitive dissonance than that produced by recovered memories. A woman is suddenly asked to believe that her father, previously regarded as someone who loved and protected her, raped her throughout her childhood. In The Courage to Heal, Ellen Bass and Laura Davis document the intolerable confusion and upheaval this causes.

“The hardest thing was accepting the fact that someone I loved and cherished—my father—could have violated me so deeply.” one woman told them. Another said, “It’s like you’re dissolving and there’s nothing to hold on to.” A third confessed that “trying to fit the new reality into the shattered framework of the old was enough to catapult me into total crisis. I felt my whole foundation had been stolen from me.” The Courage to Heal also relates the story of Emily, whose parents loved her and begged to talk to her. “Every time Emily spoke to her parents she became ill—the conflict between what she knew inside and what they presented was too great.” Her solution was to cut off all contact with her parents and seek reassurance from her therapist.

People tend to believe the word of an authoritative expert. So, to reduce “cognitive dissonance” inside your head, you have to banish any thought that you might be wrong. That’s why people will continue to hold tightly to their beliefs sometimes, even in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary. There are even instances of women who have been proven to be medical virgins who continue to insist that they were raped all during their childhoods and repressed all memory of it.

Festinger pointed out a paradoxical truth—the greater the underlying dissonance, the more confidence a person must feel in the decision to opt for a new world view, and the less likely she will be to reverse that decision. Once you become an incest survivor, in other words, it becomes unbearable to consider that you might be wrong. You are stuck with your new identity. To turn back would renew the confusion.

“The social group is at once a major source of cognitive dissonance for the individual,” Festinger wrote, “and a major vehicle for eliminating and reducing the dissonance.” Bass
and Davis repeatedly emphasize how important such groups are in *The Courage to Heal*. “Being in a group with other survivors can be a powerful way to vanquish shame. When you hear other women talk about their abuse and are not disgusted, and when you see those same women listen to your story with respect, you begin to see yourself as a proud survivor.” This social reinforcement is key. “Social support is particularly easy to obtain when a rather large number of persons who associate together are all in the same situation,” Festinger wrote in 1957. “If everyone believes it, it most certainly must be true.”

It is truly remarkable how suggestible people become in groups, as Solomon Asch demonstrated in a series of 1956 experiments. Eight college students, assembled in a group, were shown a simple line, then asked to specify which of three alternative lines were the same length. Although the answer was obvious, seven of the students, who were coached ahead of time, answered incorrectly. The real subject of the experiment always reported next to last. Seventy-five percent of these subjects gave an incorrect answer at least once, although when they performed the test alone, they always chose the correct response. “At first I thought I had the wrong instructions,” one student said, “then that something was wrong with my eyes and my head.”

More recently, experimental psychologist Elizabeth Loftus has conducted an experiment that shows how someone can easily create a new traumatic childhood memory. She suggested that her research assistant, Jim, tell a younger sibling, 14-year-old Chris, that he had been lost in a shopping mall (a mythical event) when he was five years old, but that a nice man wearing a flannel shirt had found him and brought him back to his parents. At first, Chris accurately reported that he didn’t remember any such event, but that he would think about it.

Two days later, Chris not only “remembered,” but he described convincingly how he had felt that day. “I was so scared that I would never see my family again. I knew that I was in trouble.” Two weeks later, Chris had rehearsed the memory in some detail, filling in the gaps. He recalled, with some emotion, how he had been frightened and cried. He had created an image of his rescuer, who was bald and wore glasses. Even after he was “debriefed” and told that the story wasn’t true, Chris clung to it. “Really? I thought I remembered being lost...and looking around for you guys. I do remember that, and then crying, and Mom coming up and saying, ‘Where were you? Don’t you ever do that again.’ “ Five subjects in the pilot sample, ranging in age from 8 to 42, easily developed memories for being lost in a mall at the age of five.

So you see—perfectly normal people can come to believe quite extraordinary things. To believe in a delusion, you do not need to be mentally ill. All it takes is to catch you at a vulnerable time when you are desperate for help, urgently seeking an answer.

When you go to therapy, you are by definition in a vulnerable state, looking for such answers. If the therapist, a figure of authority, says you have “all the symptoms” of a sex abuse survivor, and that you probably repressed the memories, and that you will only get better if you remember, there is a powerful motivation to “remember” abuse.

Unfortunately, once you do “remember” abuse, it draws you into an ever-increasing spiral of misery, rage, confusion, panic attacks, and more horrifying visions of abuse. Recovered memory therapy generally makes people worse, not better. Therapists who encourage “memory” retrieval are fond of saying, “You have to get worse before you get better.” But the getting worse seems to be the only part that happens. While getting in touch with more and more “memories,” you rage and suffer. You lose sleep. You lose your job and friends, your family, and often your marriage and children.

There is hope, however. Once those suffering from “recovered memories” begin to live in reality, they can reclaim their lives and the joy. For those who are still in the grip of recovered memories: Take a clear, cool, objective look at your life. Are you better off now? Do you miss your family? Is this the way you want to live the rest of your life?

Now, you who have recovered “memories” probably really are suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), but it isn’t from an abusive childhood. It’s from having your entire foundation ripped out from under you by recovered memory therapy. It is natural for you to feel devastated and angry. You want answers. You want your past back. You want your family back. You want your mind back.

The good news is—everything is there waiting for you. Travel down the path to reality, fight your way back to understanding, and you can not only reclaim your family—you can help make it better than it ever was. But it will take a lot of courage, a lot of work. Nothing in this life is easy.

Mark Pendergrast is the author of *Victims of Memory: Incest Accusations and Shattered Lives* in addition to several other books.

**Paper of Interest**

*Myths, Damned Myths, and Psychoanalytic Case Histories*

By Allen Esterson

Allen Esterson dissects a BBC radio program on Freud and hysteria in which a researcher claimed to have uncovered early childhood sexual abuse in one of his patients that he directly associated with symptoms that developed in adulthood. Paper is available at: [http://www.butterfliesandwheels.com/articleprint.php?num=58](http://www.butterfliesandwheels.com/articleprint.php?num=58)

(Posted 5/5/2004)
Leading Irish Child Abuse Expert Is Sued

A 23-year-old Dublin woman is suing Dr. Moira Woods, Ireland’s leading expert in child sexual abuse. The plaintiff, Cherie Eustace, claims that she was falsely accused of sexual abuse as a result of Dr. Woods’s treatment when she was 5-years-old. At that time, Dr. Woods concluded that she had been sexually abused. The plaintiff was estranged from her father as a consequence of the accusations, but she has since been reunited with him. Dr. Woods, the former head of the Sexual Assault Trauma Unit at the Rotunda Hospital in Dublin, has strongly denied the charges.

In December 2001, the Irish Medical Council made a finding of professional misconduct against Dr. Woods. In 1992, several families complained that they had been falsely accused because of Dr. Woods. After ten years, the Medical Council issued a statement concluding that Dr. Woods had "failed to gather all the available evidence and/or did not follow protocols...and/or failed to review additional information received after preliminary findings had been reached."

John Stoll Released

Kern County Judge John Kelly overturned the conviction of John Stoll this spring. Stoll, who was convicted on 17 counts of child molestation, spent almost 20 years in prison. Prosecutors will not seek to retry him.

After a lengthy hearing, Judge Kelly noted that prosecutors had presented no physical evidence at the original trial and that none of the six children who accused Stoll had been examined by doctors. The case rested solely on the children’s testimony that the defense contended had been coerced. Four of the six accusers recently testified that they had lied on the stand, saying they were coerced. Unfortunately, Stoll’s son has stuck to the original claims he made during a bitter divorce and custody fight.

On May 4, John Stoll walked out of the prison that had been his home for almost 20 years. Stoll, now 61, was one of the 30 people convicted in the California Kern County (Bakersfield) child abuse hysteria in the early 1980s. He said that he survived in prison by posing as a drug runner. Because of the work of the California Innocence Project during the past two years, he has finally been released, one of the last to be set free.

As early as 1986, a yearlong investigation of the Kern County cases was done by the California Attorney General’s Office. The investigation concluded that local authorities had used “suggestive” questioning that led children to give answers that they wanted. At that time, the “attorney general said there was both a shortage of corroborating evidence and that some alleged victims were simply parroting what they were told in questioning or what they heard other children say.” [1]


“The real tragedy is that those who ran the justice system knew the charges were trumped up [in 1986], especially with the cases began falling apart in the appellate courts. But it still took a dozen years for the victims to win their freedom.”

John Boren

Outreau Case in France

The largest pedophilia case ever presented in France fell apart in May on the 10th day of trial when the main witness said: “I’m sick, I’m a liar, I lied about everything.”

The case began when a teacher became suspicious about the obscene behavior of a child. Upon questioning, the child, along with other children, told harrowing stories of rape, torture and bestiality that were supposed to have taken place between 1996 and 2000 at a home in the grim steel-making town of Outreau. The mother in this home made a detailed confession and then proceeded to claim that her ex-husband and 16 other adults had participated in the abuse of at least 18 children ranging in age from 3 to 12.

It appears that although some abuse may have occurred, the lives of many people were unnecessarily devastated. An accused father, Alain Marecaux, who was a court bailiff and property lawyer, shouted: “I’ve lost everything. They stole my children. Killed my mother.” The children in these families had been placed in care and one even tried to commit suicide at the start of the trial.

Defense lawyers are demanding to know why a series of expert psychologists had declared the evidence of the children to be “credible” despite many gaps and factual discrepancies. It seems that France is now facing a painful examination of how such a fraud could have been taken so seriously by so many people for so long.


“Nothing fixes a thing so intensely in the memory as the wish to forget it.”

Montaigne
Defenses Wither for Negligent Abuse Investigators

Two new Washington appellate decisions give persons falsely accused of child abuse better prospects for recovering damages from Child Protective Services and police.

Incomplete investigation renders CPS liable—In *Tyner v. Dept. of Social and Health Services,*[1] the Washington Supreme Court reinstated a falsely accused father’s verdict against CPS for his separation from his children. A CPS caseworker did not attempt to speak with witnesses the father had identified. The caseworker’s conclusion that the abuse allegation was unfounded did not appear in his report to the court. These failings were negligent.

The court of appeals set aside the verdict. It reasoned that CPS’s negligence was not the proximate (direct) cause of the separation because a court had ordered it, even though the court did so after receiving CPS’s report.

The supreme court did find proximate cause. If CPS does not give a court all material information, it held, the court’s action does not shield CPS from liability.

Police also liable for negligent investigation—The second case arose from the notorious Wenatchee “child sex abuse ring” investigation of 1994-95. In *Rodriguez v. Perez,*[2] children and parents sued police, alleging negligent police interviewing during the investigation. The trial court dismissed their claims, relying on case law that the police’s duty to investigate crime is owed only to the public at large, not to particular persons.

The court of appeals reversed. It relied on a statute directing both police and CPS to investigate child abuse reports for the benefit of children and their parents and custodians. The statute, the court reasoned, thus created a protected class whose members, police officers, like CPS workers, have a legal duty to investigate properly.

Amirault Update

Gerald “Tooky” Amirault was finally released from prison at the end of April—in time to give his daughter away at her wedding. He also received his college diploma from Boston University. He has been very busy catching up with the 18 missing years, but he and his family took time to attend an FMSF meeting in Massachusetts. At that meeting he thanked families for their support and spoke of his intention to do what he could to prevent future miscarriages of justice.

Families discussed the circumstances of the Amirault case and wondered what had become of the child-interviewer, who had helped to cause such unnecessary devastation. Susan J. Kelley began interrogating the children from Fells Acres in 1984 when she was an R.N., and a graduate intern in a program at Boston College School of Nursing. She earned her Ph.D. from Boston College’s Department of Developmental Psychology in 1998 and her dissertation was titled, “Responses of Children and Parents to Sexual Abuse and Satanic Ritual Abuse in Day Care Centers.” Susan J. Kelley is now Dean of the College of Health and Human Services at Georgia State University and has apparently continued to cling to her beliefs about ritual abuse. Among her publications are a number of articles on the subject, one as recent as 1996.[1]

Our system isn’t always immune to destructive pressures, and the child-abuse prosecutions of the 1980s were one such instance. Mr. Amirault’s prosecution was driven by the passions of the times—in this case, the belief that child predators lurked everywhere and that the child “victims” must be believed at all costs.

Along the way, the law was stood on its head. The rules of evidence were changed to accommodate the prosecution; the burden of proof was put on the accused. Four- and five-year-olds were coached to say what adults wanted to hear. All this was done in the name of virtue, with the result being the kind of catastrophic miscarriage of justice we saw in Mr. Amirault’s case. There never was any truth to the charges brought against him. Nor was there anything that would, in saner times, have passed for evidence in an American courtroom.

One of the reasons behind the district attorney’s decision last week not to oppose Mr. Amirault’s release on parole was that in order to have him classified as a “sexually dangerous person” there would have had to be a virtual re-trial of the entire Amirault case. The DA had to have been deterred by the prospect of parading into a courtroom with the incredible fantasies extracted from Mr. Amirault’s alleged victims—about secret rooms, magic drinks, animal butchery, assaults by a bad clown. Then-District Attorney Scott Harshbarger had offered them as “proof” of the Amiraults’ guilt.


“*It is only now understood that memory and imagination are at base the same process, and they can contaminate one another.*”

Philip Hilts
Repressed Memory Therapy Not Extinct

My daughter called me earlier this week to tell me about her friend, a young lady in her thirties, single, living with her single brother and father. The friend had been depressed and went to seek help at a Child and Family Services organization in a near-by suburb. The therapist she began seeing took a maternity leave and was replaced by another therapist whom I shall refer to as “Mistherapist.”

Before long Mistherapist suggested to the friend that her depression was probably due to the fact that she was abused in her childhood by her father. The friend was dismayed by this slur, as she had no suspicion that any abuse had ever taken place. Mistherapist recommended “Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing” (EMDR) as a treatment for the trauma the friend was not aware of.

I know that there is always a risk in sharing stories that are not first-hand, but it seems that repressed memory therapy is not quite extinct.

A dad

No Mention of the Past

Our nightmare started in October 1990 when we met with our daughter and her unlicensed therapist at his office. That was when my wife and I were informed that our daughter had been sexually abused by one of her siblings or by us from the time that she was two until she was nine. At the time of the meeting she was twenty-three, out of school, and working in the city. No facts. No rebuttal permitted. Just a bizarre accusation!

Our life was turned upside down and remained so for over a year until we learned of the False Memory Syndrome Foundation and realized that other families were experiencing similar situations. In the interim we tried to track down any evidence we could find that such an accusation could have any validity. We could find none. But from the date of that meeting our daughter essentially removed herself from the family—cutting off her parents and four siblings. It remained that way for over thirteen years.

For the first few years, while she lived in the same area, we would see her occasionally but our interactions always became confrontational. She married a man who claimed he had been similarly abused and they moved to another city. She was soon divorced and then remarried. We had a few meetings, but all of them ended acrimoniously. Occasionally she spoke with two of her siblings, but most of our information about her came from other acquaintances who might run into her.

We decided to sue her therapist in federal court. Unfortunately, we lost the case against him when our daughter sided with him and she persuaded an aunt to testify against us. The jury decided that this was a family feud and wanted no part of it. That episode certainly did not help the relationship, but it was not getting any better in any case.

During all these years, we continued to write to our daughter on her birthdays and holidays and to call her periodically. All letters and gifts went unanswered. Gifts were returned and hate mail was sent our way. We kept trying and we relied on prayer as our only hope for reestablishing contact. Occasionally we received calls in the dark of the night blasting us in which she sounded badly in need of help. We tried to help at the moment but the moment would pass and the break would continue.

A few months ago we started to receive phone calls from our daughter, chatting amicably as if there were no problem nor ever had been one. It was as if thirteen years had not passed by. She is in the process of another divorce and has embarked on a new occupation with some success. My wife and I had a nice three-hour visit with her in her home. We made no mention of the past nor did she. While we are hesitant to believe that our troubles are over, we are grateful to have had this visit and hope for more contact. Sadly, her siblings are still smarting from the hurt they have felt and some are reluctant to simply ignore the intervening years.

My wife and I are enormously grateful to FMSF for its inspiration and background and for the comfort it has afforded us. We will continue to pray for others and ourselves as we try to rebuild our own family.

A grateful father

Why I Sued My Daughter

Approximately five years ago my wife and I were divorced but, after 8 months apart, we decided to get back together. As we finalized the plans, my ex-wife began to cry and said, “I don’t know if I can do this. There is a big problem I have not told you about.” When I asked what the problem was, she replied that it had to do with our youngest daughter. With great difficulty, she finally was able to tell me: “She accused you of molesting her when she was a child between the ages of 9 to 15.”

I was shocked and assured her that I had done no such thing. My ex-wife said that she did not believe I could have done what my daughter had accused me of doing. She had been a stay-at-home mom; my daughter slept in the same room with an older sister, and her room was only 5 feet away from one brother and across the hall from another. In addition, my ex-wife had been an extremely light sleeper and for those reasons she did not see how the accusations could possibly be true.
I offered to take a polygraph test. We made an appointment and were told that the cost would be $1,000. I was also told that I must sign a letter to accept the outcome of the test as it was and that the results could be held against me if they were not favorable. I signed the letter.

My ex-wife and I answered a lot of questions. Then, over a three-hour period, I took the polygraph test. No deception was found. The polygrapher I used did work for the FBI, CIA, State Police, City Police, and the Sheriff’s Dept. Many people assured me that his credentials and reputation were excellent. In fact, one attorney told me that two of his clients were released because of the results of polygraph tests with this person. I would think that anyone who was not guilty would be willing to take a polygraph. I was also tested by a forensic psychiatrist, the head of the department at the State University and found not to have a psychological profile of a child molester or pedophile.

I have three grandchildren and my accusing daughter let me see them only on a very limited basis. I put up with this intolerable situation for two years, but things continued to deteriorate. My daughter, who had been in therapy for eight years claimed to recover more memories in her therapy and began to tell people in our town. Both my attorney and the polygrapher advised me that I should not be around my grandchildren because my daughter might charge me with molesting them.

I decided to have a meeting with my ex-wife, my daughter and her husband. I told my daughter that she had two choices: she could recant her accusation that I had abused her or she could take a polygraph with the same person with whom I had my polygraph. I told her I would pay for the test and post a $50,000 cash bond in her name if she passed. I also told her that if she refused the two offers, I would sue her in order to clear my name. My daughter and her husband jumped from the table and called me terrible names. They said I could not see or talk to my grandchildren for as long as I lived. I have not seen them for two years and it breaks my heart because we were very close prior to the “memories” that arose in therapy.

It has been a tough road and a costly one, but my life as a father, grandfather, and human being has been made unbearably painful because of the accusation. The purpose of my lawsuit is to vindicate myself, to preserve my self-esteem, and to restore my family. Frankly, I am not going to sit back and just take it, as most families appear to have done. I do not want to go to my grave with this lie on my mind.

I thank the Foundation for its effort. The newsletter and the information have been priceless.

A fighting dad

**Illinois-Wisconsin FMS Society Conference**

Sunday, October 3, 2004, 1-5 pm
Falk Pavilion, Milwaukee, WI

A representative of the Wisconsin Innocence Project will speak on the topic:

“Wrongful Prosecutions: How they come about, how they are sustained and how the Patriot Act contributes to them.”

Also –
- A parent panel:
  “Waltzing with the Elephant”—various viewpoints and strategies for dealing with your children
- A recanting answers questions
- Round tables
$20 per person including a box supper at the conclusion of the conference.

For more information, contact:
Bill Lanz at 815-724-6473
(welgal@aol.com)

“**We humans love stories, as we are constantly reinventing and recasting the narrative of our lives. Sometimes such stories are beautiful reminders of our fragile humanity and need for one another. Yet other stories can inspire misguided, bloody crusades or family rifts based on “recovered memories” of abuse that never occurred.”**


*Atlanta Journal-Constitution, p. 4M.*

**HUNGRY FOR MONSTERS**

A documentary film by George Paul Csicsery

When 15-year-old Nicole Althaus told a teacher that her father was molesting her, the quiet affluent Pittsburgh suburb of Mt. Lebanon, Pennsylvania, was turned inside out. Nicole’s father, Rick, was arrested and charged with sexually abusing Nicole amidst bizarre satanic rituals. With the support of her favorite teacher, police, therapists, social workers, and officers of the court, all of whom believed her stories, Nicole began to embellish her initial accusations. As she recovered more memories of wild orgies, sacrificed babies, and murder, more people were arrested, including her mother and a pair of strangers.

A year later, all charges were dropped, and Nicole admitted that her accusations were false. After Nicole and her parents reconciled, they sued the authorities. This time, Nicole claimed she was the victim of abuse perpetrated by the very people who had supported her allegations against her parents.

Ordering Information
The introductory VHS price is $195.00 to universities/libraries/ institutions and $39.00 to individuals for home use. Add $5.00 for shipping.

George Csicsery
P.O. Box 22833,
Oakland, CA 94609-9284.
Fax 510-429-9273.
Email: geosci@compuserve.com
http://www.undergroundbride.com/lying
spirits.html
Skeptical Information on Theophostic Counseling
http://home.wanadoo.nl
/traumaversterking
English language web site of Dutch retractor.

Legal Web Sites of Interest
• www.casestassist.com
• www.findlaw.com
• www.legalengine.com
• www.accused.com
• www.abuse-excuse.com

Victims of Memory: Sex Abuse Accusations and Shattered Lives
by Mark Pendergrast.
Upper Access Books.

“An impressive display of scholarship...a comprehensive treatment of the recovered-memories controversy... Pendergrast offers a broader portrayal of the social and cultural contexts of the recovered-memories phenomenon [than other books on the subject]. His treatment is also distinguished by some welcome historical perspective.... Pendergrast demonstrates a laudable ability to lay out all sides of the argument... [He] renders a sympathetic portrayal of recovery therapists as well-intentioned but misinformed players in a drama that has veered out of control.”

Daniel L. Schacter,
Scientific American

To order: 800-310-8320 or
www.upperaccess.com/books.htm
#226v2

Remembering Trauma
by Richard McNally
Harvard University Press
The most comprehensive review of research about trauma and memory
Highly recommended

Science and Pseudoscience in Clinical Psychology
S. O. Lilienfeld, S.J. Lynn and J.M. Lohr (eds.)
Highly recommended
KENTUCKY
Louisville - Last Sun. (MO) @ 2pm
Bob 502-367-1838

MAINE
Runford
Carolyn 207-364-8891

PORTLAND - 4th Sun. (MO)
Wally & Bobby 207-878-9812

MASSACHUSETTS/New EnGLAND
Andover - 2nd Sun. (MO) @ 1pm
Frank 978-263-9795

MICHIGAN
Grand Rapids Area - 1st Mon. (MO)
Bill & Marge 616-383-0382

Greater Detroit Area
Nancy 248-642-8077

Ann Arbor
Martha 734-439-4055

MINNESOTA
Terry & Collette 507-642-3630

Dan & Joan 651-631-2247

MISSOURI
Kansas City - Meeting as called
Pat 785-738-4840

St. Louis Area - call for meeting time
Karen 314-432-8789

- last Sat. of month) @ 12:30 pm
Tom 417-753-4878

Roxie 417-781-2058

MONTANA
Lee & Avone 406-443-3189

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Mark 802-872-0847

NEW JERSEY
Sally 609-927-5343 (Southern)

Nancy 973-729-1433 (Northern)

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

Southwest Room - Presbyterian Hospital
Maggie 505-662-7521 (after 6:30 pm) or
Sy 505-758-0726

NEW YORK
Manhattan
Michael 212-481-6655

Westchester, Rockland, etc.
Barbara 914-761-3627

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 or
Tulsa
Jim 918-582-7363

OREGON
Portland area
Kathy 503-655-1587

PENNSYLVANIA
Pittsburgh
Rick & Renee 412-563-5509

Montrose
John 570-278-2040

Wayne (includes S. NJ)
Jim & Jo 610-783-0396

TENNESSEE
Nashville
Kate 615-665-1160

TEXAS
Houston
Jo or Beverly 713-464-8970

El Paso
Mary Lou 915-591-0271

UTAH
Keith 801-467-0669

VERMONT
Mark 802-872-0847

VIRGINIA
Sue 703-273-2343

WASHINGTON
See Oregon

WISCONSIN
Katie & Leo 414-476-0285 or
Susanne & John 608-427-3686

WYOMING
Alan & Lorinda 307-322-4170

CONTACTS & MEETINGS - 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

Warkworth
Ethel 705-924-2546

Burlington
Ken & Marina 905-637-6030

Waubaushene
Paula 705-543-0318

QUEBEC, CANADA
St. André Est.
Mavis 450-537-8187

AUSTRALIA
Evelyn everei@adam.com.au

BELGIUM
werkg.fict.herinneringen@altavista.net

ISRAEL
FMS ASSOCIATION fax-972-2-625-9282

NETHERLANDS
Task Force FMS of Werkgroep Fictieve
Herinneringen

NEW ZEALAND
Colleen 09-416-7443

SWEDEN
Ake Moller FAX 48-431-217-90

THE UNITED KINGDOM
The British False Memory Society
Madeline 44-1225 868-6822

Deadline for the SEPT/OCT Newsletter is August 15. Meeting notices MUST be in writing and should be sent no later than two months before meeting.
FMSF Scientific and Professional Advisory Board
July 1, 2004

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; Lorel 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; Martin Gardner, Author, Hendersonville, NC; 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; David A. Halperin, M.D., (deceased) Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, NY; Ernest Hilgard, Ph.D., (deceased) Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA; John Hochman, M.D., UCLA Medical School, Los Angeles, CA; David S. Holmes, Ph.D., University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS; Philip S. Holzman, Ph.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, MA; Robert A. Karlin, Ph.D., Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ; Harold Lief, M.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; 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; Martin Orne, M.D., Ph.D., (deceased) University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; Loren Pankratz, Ph.D., Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland, OR; Campbell Perry, Ph.D., (deceased) Concordia University, Montreal, Canada; 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; Theodore Sarbin, Ph.D., (deceased) Indiana University, Bloomington, IN; 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; Margaret Singer, Ph.D., (deceased) University of California, Berkeley, CA; Ralph Slovenko, J.D., Ph.D., Wayne State University Law School, Detroit, MI; Donald Spence, Ph.D., Robert Wood Johnson Medical Center, Piscataway, NJ; 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

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 FMS Newsletter is published 6 times a year by the False Memory Syndrome Foundation. The newsletter is mailed to anyone who contributes at least $30.00. It is also available at no cost by email (see above) or on the FMSF website: www.FMSFonline.org

Your Contribution Will Help

Please fill out all information please print

Visa: Card # & exp. date:__________________________

Discover: Card # & exp. date:__________________________

Mastercard: Card # & 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.