

"Elder Abuse: TV versus Reality"

Articles in the media were showing up everywhere about people of trust, not only family members but primary caregivers and befriended strangers alike, were throwing elders into home fires, poisoning them, beating them up, starving them and leaving them for dead before taking what they could. If it was sibling rivalry, then, what was everyone thinking? That the majority of these crimes was being committed by a son or a daughter who hated their other sibling so much that they were taking that revenge out on their parent(s) by robbing them blind and killing them while they were at it?

It's not so simple.

Elder Abuse is referred to as a "hidden crime" because the perpetrator of the abuse against an elder has gone "un-witnessed" and is being committed in a Machiavellian manner where the evidence needed to prosecute any of them is very cunningly concealed by a high degree of psychological manipulation.

Elder Abuse is a crime against another individual that begs to be investigated as such and not to be treated as a family counselling matter where "feelings" are explored.

No perpetrator of Emotional Abuse or Emotional Elder Abuse is ever going to walk into a clinic and ask for help to stop what they're doing. They are fully aware of what they are doing and they don't want to stop. And unfortunately, you're not going to get these perpetrators to confess or stop the abuse because what they're doing and concealing is a criminal act where the prize is a free ticket to financial freedom without much possibility of prosecution.

Dr. Phil also posed a dilemma during the interview: Who is lying? Who to believe?

In a real-time setting, the observations one can make from the interaction between two people, one supposedly a victim and the other supposedly the perpetrator of Emotional Elder Abuse, with the intervener/mediator present, is a very important part of the investigation process as it will help determine: what is going on, what has been going on and who is the real culprit?

Even this half hour exchange was very helpful.

As an exercise in investigating Emotional Elder Abuse, I will take you guide you through a typical intervention / interview process, one similar to what I would conduct, one step at a time so that you can learn from what happened on the show as well as what was shared by both guests. It will help you understand the significance behind typical actions and simple control techniques that are used by an offender to conceal and commit the crime. Perpetrators of Emotional Abuse and Emotional Elder Abuse can be spotted easily if you know what to look for.

I will begin with the background story and certain facts that were revealed to us by Dr. Phil, the brother, Michael, and the sister, Shelley, during the show, either via film clips or the question and answer period they had with Dr. Phil. Then I'll examine, more closely, what was seen and heard that can be used as "identifiers" when trying to determine who the perpetrator is i.e. by comparing both subjects' behaviour and speech patterns. And finally, I'll bring up certain things that weren't noticed, or perhaps just not discussed for some reason and how that bears on the investigation.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R2QU-3t5zRU>

Aired on:

January 4, 2013

Part 1

The background story:

- Michael is claiming Shelley embezzled \$100,000 from her elders.
- Both parents are debilitated: the father has Parkinson's; the mother has Alzheimer's.
- When Shelley was 8 years old, she says she was devastated when she found out she was adopted and from that day forth their relationship changed; she claims she became a victim of abuse, both physically and verbally; she was "thrown out" when she was 16 years old *"because I wouldn't mow the lawn"*.
- When Shelley moved her parents from California to Canada where she lives, she says the onset of the Alzheimer's hadn't begun.
- Michael did object to the move but it was too late: *"I got a call the house was up for sale, it was sold in 4 days and they were packed by the end of the month."*
- Michael says his parents didn't have the capacity to stop Shelley.

- Michael's father told him that he tried to help Shelley out; he said Shelley promised to pay them back; the money was to help her purchase a building and business.
- The family (brother and parents) hired lawyers to determine what happened.
- There are no contracts for the business; Shelley said her father didn't allow one to be drawn up. Michael claimed that was not true.
- Shelley claims the money was a gift, then claims it was a loan, then says it was deemed by her father as early inheritance; she does claim to have made several payments towards the loan before she ran into trouble; when the business was sold, she paid all outstanding bills and that there was nothing left.
- Shelley claims her father was a silent partner in the business; she does admit that the parents did not benefit from the business transaction in any way.
- Michael said Shelley called him and was told that his father was dying and it was his last chance to see his father; he was told to come to Canada immediately; if he traveled to Canada to see them, Shelley would offer 3 months free rent in exchange for his help in her sub shop. Shelley claims that's a lie.
- Shelley says the economy turned around, she lost the business; she was *"getting close to her parents when this happened and was making effort to be there more frequently"*.
- Michael said lawyers were hired to investigate Shelley's business; they ordered her to cease all business transactions while the investigation was underway; Shelley said she received no requests or demands; Michael says she ignored all demands, sold the business and *"ran"*.
- The siblings haven't spoken to each other in 6 years; the last time was when Shelley sold the business and left.
- Michael moved his elders into an apartment.
- The mother cries daily because all of their retirement savings are gone.
- The father is now in long term care; Michael and his mother visit him daily.
- Michael cares for his mother 24/7; has support workers coming in during the day to help him get some respite time so he can go do Tai Chi.
- Shelley claims she was on good terms with her father the last time she saw him.
- Shelley has no relationship with her mother and says she never had one.
- Shelley considers her relationship with Michael *"dead"*; is not interested in salvaging the relationship.
- Shelley claims Michael is abusive with the parents and has been violent and verbally abusive towards her in the past; claims also that he is not providing the care their mother needs; she claims she should be in long term care as well.
- Michael claims he has done drugs in the past, but not now.
- Shelley claims her daughter visited her father and found his teeth punched out; Shelley claims Michael did this.
- Michael explained that Shelley is adopted but is family, by blood; she is Michael's cousin; also claims that their family treated her as family and was never abused.

- Michael claims that this is not the first time Shelley has taken advantage of an older person: she befriended an older gentleman, took one of his credit cards and purchased a van and a computer; Michael said his father told him he paid off the man's lawyers to make them go away. Shelley denies all of this happened.
- To this day, Shelley keeps track of her family surreptitiously (as was revealed on the show): Dr. Phil asked her about a contest for "*Best Caregiver Cruise*" that Michael was entered into which she sabotaged; Shelley claims that when she called the hospital and asked about her father, she was told she's not allowed to visit him and that the nurses at the long term facility have told her they were not allowed to give her any information about her father because Michael has Power of Attorney; she claims that many people give her information about how her brother treats his elders, that he abuses them daily and doesn't make as many visits to the facility as he claims to see the father; she claims that people have told her Michael is a hoarder, drinks and parties hard and while he does, he sends his mother to her room.
- Michael asked Shelley several times during the show to show him proof of what she was claiming to be the truth i.e. that he has stolen from her, "*what people?*", "*how do you know about that?*". Shelley never answered him.
- Dr. Phil asked if Shelley has demanded an audit or evaluation on Michael; Shelley claims she found out most of these things "*just now*".
- Michael says he would stand up to any evaluation or audit if needed, to prove that he is a good caregiver and is providing for his mother appropriately.
- Currently Michael is the sole caregiver for his parents 24/7; is currently not employed "*yet*".

Part 2:

Observations that can be made from what was seen and heard on the show

Perpetrators of Emotional Abuse don't start out in life with any real intentions of doing what they end up doing but, with time, they do eventually realize the value in the skills that they possess and enjoy honing them to perfection over time. They realize they have a knack at being able to escape life's challenges and hurdles merely by manipulating people by playing with their feelings and, thus, influencing their perception of things without much effort and that they don't much care who these people are. Eventually, they become so practiced at what they do that their actions fall into a particular pattern and only need to be altered slightly as they move from one victim to another. When it comes to Emotional Elder Abuse, if these perpetrators are family, they have the added advantage over others in that they know their family members intimately. As they cunningly manipulate everyone in such ways that they leave everyone questioning what they have witnessed or felt, they can accomplish pulling off all sorts of devious criminal acts without much

effort. Furthermore, they have an incredibly high level of patience that gives them the ability to remain “concealed” or persevere for years if necessary until they get what they eventually want or need. They may not even “engage” in anything abusive until one day they realize they’re in their mid-life years and don’t have a plan for their future. It is at this point, where they appreciate another advantage that they have in being family, in that the family that has grown up with them, and has known them for 40 years or more, won’t even begin to suspect them of anything, or have any idea that they have now become potential victims.

Either way, from the very beginning, when emotionally abusive people do begin acting out, it will be apparent and it will be obvious, yet it will be a situation where those who witness anything will either dismiss it, ignore it or enable it, depending on the relationship. But there are patterns.....

In healthy or mature relationships, you will generally find the following types of traits/behaviour:

- mutual decision-making – ability to make compromises – trust – support and nurturing – open discussion about finances – security – willingness to spend time with each other – sense of responsibility – accountability – willingness to listen and understand the other’s point of view – open, fair and interactive communication – mutually respect - willingness to accommodate and please

Relationships where Emotional Abuse is taking place you will generally find the following types of traits/behaviour:

- inequality where someone is taking advantage of another – no security – unhappiness – criticism
- accusations – control issues – demanding nature – secretive manner – unaccommodating manner – unreasonableness – judgemental manner – tendency to be degrading – tendencies towards being hurtful – blaming – probing – certain amount of confusion – family ties or relationships are restricted or non-existent – trust is non-existent – outside relationships/activities are severed/restricted – everything good is turned around and viewed as bad, evil, fake

Based on this, while watching the Dr. Phil Show, I made the following observations about the brother Michael and the parents:

1. The family goes by the book: hires lawyers, expects to find contracts, and honors their debts/commitments.

2. Michael seems to do all the “heavy lifting” in family care: searching out and relocating the parents after the sister leaves; searching out long term care facilities for the father; searching out home care/support workers for his mother; providing 24/7 nursing/home care for his mother; overseeing welfare of his father in long-term care.
3. Michael’s only claim/accusation has been, always, only that his sister is guilty of embezzlement; this claim is supported by both parents.
4. Michael consistently asked for proof/details of claims/accusations being made by his sister. He wanted her to back up her claims. His requests went ignored.
5. Michael showed respectful behaviour: always addressed sister directly; never reprimanded his sister for her behaviour on the show; treats his parents well; is devoted to the parents.
6. The brother stated he was willing to go through an audit to stand up to his sister’s accusations of abuse. Michael is proud of his level of care and attention to detail.
7. Michael answered all questions quickly, concisely and directly.

I also made the following observations about the sister Shelley:

1. No financial/bank statements or legal documents for the business have been made available by the sister or discovered for audit/investigation.
2. All of her relationships with the family have been unstable in the past since the age of 8 years; she considers her relationship with her brother Michael and her mother now “dead” or non-existent; she stated that she is not interested in working on any reunion but still seems to be keeping tabs on the family surreptitiously (i.e. hunting down the hospital where her father is and calling them for information, keeping tabs on Michael’s whereabouts and activities without his knowledge apparently).
3. She never answered questions directly, always went to another topic or went to accuse her brother or mother of something else. When she did answer a question, it was done in a roundabout, long winded manner that went off topic usually, where she spoke haltingly.
4. When the brother was speaking, Shelley displayed childish behaviour: smirking and winking at the audience, ridiculing him, interrupting him, talking over him, and chastising him.
5. According to the sister, everyone is lying: lawyers, father, mother, brother, support workers. She’s saying she’s the only one telling the truth.
6. The sister was ambushing her brother Michael with all sorts of new, unfounded accusations constantly.
7. Shelley, at times, appeared very upset (sniffing) when she spoke about the money that she received from her parents to invest in the business and then lost, but not that she lost her parents’ entire life savings.

8. She did agree that the parents had to mortgage their house in order to obtain the money that she needed for her new venture and that they did not make any profits from the business.
9. The father claims that she has taken advantage of at least one other elder besides them by taking his credit cards, making unauthorized purchases and leaving him with the bill. The father paid off her debts here as well.
10. Shelley seems concerned about her brother having Power of Attorney for the parents since she mentioned it for no reason.
11. She won't address her sibling directly. She stated that she would only speak to Dr. Phil and actually gave him orders to reprimand her brother at one point, which Dr. Phil objected to do.
12. She uses crass, vulgar language when she talks about her brother: *"sucking them dry"*.

Part 3:

Applying the general formula a perpetrator of Emotional Elder Abuse uses to what was observed.

The perpetrators of Emotional Elder Abuse work diligently on isolating their victim and dispelling any suspicions anyone might have about what they have witnessed or believe about an elder's circumstances, either that they seem to be a potential target or victim of abuse or that they are already in trouble at the hands of a perpetrator of the abuse.

To accomplish both in short order, they have a 10-point plan or strategy they follow to mislead people into believing that, actually, the opposite is true. They want to make people believe that the victim is quite safe in their hands but not with another person. This other person will be someone the perpetrator considers to be too close to the victim, family, friend or intervener, who needs to be distanced from their victim. They will want to sever this relationship, completely if possible, as quickly as possible, and in a manner where everyone will believe that it is in the victim's best interests if they help the perpetrator keep this person away from the victim.

Perpetrators also know something about human nature which is that basically:

1. People forget that there are two sides to every story;
2. People generally accept things at face value;
3. People can be easily influenced by a person's voice (how a message is delivered) and by the choice of words (the contents of the message).

Counting on these aspects of basic human nature not to fail them in the right circumstances, the perpetrator's strategy essentially revolves around a very basic formula that they use every time and any place:

Get everyone's attention +

Create confusion +

Maintain full control +

Sway people's attitude / behaviour

In other words, for them, it's all about manipulating people's perceptions by playing games with the truth.

How to See Past the Illusion to Get to the Truth

Clue to unravelling what the perpetrator does in order to confuse us and mess with our perception of things is to focus on:

1. How a particular action or word misleads the audience and
2. What wasn't said and how the omission of that fact could influence the outcome of the investigation.

First, let's deal with the first part: What can mislead the audience?

Let's go back to the formula.

Typical actions used by

Perpetrators to Influence or Discredit Another

To get everyone's attention + create confusion + keep control of the conversation + influence people's perceptions against (discredit) another, built within their strategy are typical behaviours or standard control tactics a perpetrator uses to accomplish this:

I.e. by constantly throwing out "generalizations" such as "*he steals*", "*she's abusive*." at the other person:

- It's meant to ambush the other, keep them off balance, and keep them constantly defending themselves against unfounded, untrue accusations.

- It's meant to shock the audience when they hear this and keep them distracted from what the perpetrator is not doing which is providing no evidence, nothing concrete, no details, nothing quantifiable to back up what they've accused the other person of.

I.e. At first opportunity tell the intervener that they refuse to talk to the other person directly and they will only direct their answers to the Intervener:

- It's meant to allow the perpetrator to create a "safe zone" for themselves;
- By leaving the asking of the questions in the hands of the naive Intervener they are counting on most of the truth to remain buried.

Perpetrators of Emotional Abuse or Emotional Elder Abuse will try to avoid answering any questions directed at them:

- They don't want to have to explain themselves, be held accountable for anything OR answer to anyone; they want to remain in complete control of the entire situation;
- Instead, they ignore the question and do something to deflect the attention away from themselves and back onto the other person almost immediately OR
- When they are asked a question, they will find a way not to answer that specific question but will find a way to get off topic where the focus of what they are talking about again is about the other person but not in a good way i.e. more accusations or lies are told.
- The perpetrator knows that the other person will always answer all questions quickly and directly, which of course, means that the attention will be back on them again, as planned.

When the other person is trying to answer the intervener's question, the perpetrator will constantly interrupt the other:

- The perpetrator means to "push (the other person's) buttons" and get the other person to lose their temper; the perpetrator is setting up that person to look "explosive", "hostile", and/or "abusive";
- When this happens, the audience will forget that they witnessed the perpetrator constantly harassing the other person and that it was just a natural reaction to get upset at that. The other person will end up being unfairly judged by the naive audience as being hostile or explosive.

When the other person is talking about how well they take care of their parents:

- Anything that that person will do or say will be turned around by the perpetrator and given a negative slant i.e. they will be called a "show-off". It's meant to discredit the other and have everyone forget about the good they are doing.

- The perpetrator will also display childish behaviour while the other person is speaking (smirking, wink-winking, laughing); it's meant to demean and discredit the other and mislead audience to believe that the other person should not be believed/trusted.

The perpetrator will constantly throw out unproven accusations at the other person:

- This usually happens when the perpetrator feels cornered and needs to distract their audience while they "buy time" and come up with a way to get out of the fix they're in; they ideally hope to change the direction of the conversation or get the attention away from themselves and back onto the other person.

The perpetrator will use crude, foul language when speaking about the other person:

- Such language will be used by the perpetrator to "shock" their audience into believing that they are perhaps being too gullible; it's meant to make a strong impact on audience and discredit the other person not to be believed/trusted.

The perpetrator will throw out claims that the other person needs to "get a life":

- The perpetrator is hoping that the audience will help them break up the relationship they have with the victim; it's another tactic they use to isolate the victim with help from unknowing accomplices.

Shelley's behaviour vs. Michael's behaviour

What we saw on Dr. Phil's show happening between the two siblings (one a suspected perpetrator of Emotional Elder Abuse and the other, the actual guardian or caretaker of the elders) and Dr. Phil was very typical, where the sister Shelley, the perpetrator, engaged every one of the proceeding tricks as she was constantly working on:

Capturing everyone's attention before

+ creating enough doubt and confusion in people's minds about everything

+ while keeping control of the conversation

= to delude everyone and escape detection

Michael, on the other hand, was constantly busy answering all of the unfounded accusations his sister was throwing out at him. Unfortunately, because of the nature of the accusations, all being very broad and indefinable, he couldn't address any of them appropriately in order to regain his credibility in the eyes of the audience. A lie or accusation thrown out at someone usually sticks if no one is either present to defend it or is unable to.

In the end, the audience was left with the notion that they didn't know who to believe? Someone was lying but they couldn't tell who...Just as Shelley had planned.

PART 4

What wasn't noticed or asked? And what impact would that have on an investigation?

Emotional Elder Abuse is a crime and should be investigated as one. And it most definitely is not a situation where investigators should underestimate the perpetrator of Emotional Elder Abuse and treat the situation as a family dispute.

WARNING BELLS

When dealing with Emotional Elder Abuse, something will always sound off warning bells. In this case, there were two things that sent off immediate warning bells.

First of all...

Shelley, as we found out, is adopted and was "devastated" when she found out. She said her family life changed. They became abusive and at age 18 years, she found herself being kicked out. She stated that "(her mother) didn't want me back. She broke me that day. There was no coming back from that." and that her brother is "so dead to me". When Dr. Phil offered counselling for the two siblings, she quickly declined. Years had gone by before she showed up in California again.

- First time she appeared, without her brother's knowledge, she sold her parent's home and "jacked" (Dr. Phil's word) her parents out of California to Canada to open up a business using their savings, which she eventually lost.

- After she ran out on them again, leaving them with her brother, she has shown up again, to be on the show, and we find out that she is apparently keeping tight tabs on her family. What does she want? Does she have an ulterior motive? There still is an estate and the brother has Power of Attorney.

Second of all...

What happened on the show gave us the opportunity to see how a perpetrator of Emotional Elder Abuse interacts with people. Perpetrators of Emotional Elder Abuse don't like surprises. Caught off guard, or when they lose control of a situation (their "veneer" cracks), that's when they retreat quickly (either physically or just do an inward "mental pause") and do a "come back" quickly when they are once again self-composed and ready to get things back under their control and in their favour. And they don't like confrontations with strong, perceptive people. They feel threatened by them. Again, they'll run and hide until the danger passes. If they feel trapped and the victim is handy, they'll have their victim stand up for them against any interveners either out of fear of any repercussions if they don't or because they have yet to realize they are defending their abuser. Either way, the typical perpetrator is a coward and an insidious villain, all in one.

So, why did she agree to do the show? Why did Shelley place herself in the spotlight, on stage, with millions of viewers with no handy exit available?

One reason has to do with her need to feed her ego:

In this case, Shelley knew about the show, had agreed to do it and she was ready for it. As far as Shelley was concerned, she was actually relishing the spotlight. Where better to toy with a TV celebrity and her interfering, too helpful sibling and recruit some sympathy for her cause. After all, it's always about their pain and their needs. If they're successful at this, it just gives them a stronger motive to continue in their ways.

Another reason has to do with the perpetrator's inherent superiority complex:

It allows them to believe that no one is smart enough to figure out what they've been up to or that they're being manipulated. Their ability to stage or phrase things a certain way or omit just the right detail is how they manage to affect people's perception or attitude and gain support against their victim. That, and the fact that only they know the truth, gives them the edge they need to outmaneuver the best of the best. They believe they're superior, but what they're actually doing is merely manipulating the truth, and it works. Again, it just strengthens their resolve to continue in their ways.

How a real investigation should look like

To sort this out, you have to remain focused and start with what wasn't revealed. In other words, what is the other side of the story...because there is one... ALWAYS.

Not only will perpetrators want you to forget this one fact but they also know that if you start pinning them down and having them be accountable for their claims and accusations, they won't be able to manipulate the situation anymore and it will reveal who they really are - something they fear the most. (Shelley showed signs of this happening a couple of times but regained her composure quickly.)

Also, if this was real life and this case was reported by Michael and his parents to the police, an investigation should be conducted as a crime and acknowledging that, the investigation should involve interviewing everyone related to the victim in order to be able to piece the entire story together and to determine:

- a) Whether a crime has been committed and who is the perpetrator?
- b) What level of abuse has taken place?
- c) How safe is the victim in their present situation?
- d) Is the victim in any future danger?

QUESTIONS THAT SHOULD COME TO MIND

With regards to Shelley, questions need to be asked to determine what her motives are for reuniting with the family:

- Why was she "devastated" to find out she's adopted? (Is she lying about this in order to build a case against her parents and how she claims she was treated? It is a common ploy with perpetrators. Gains them sympathy falsely.)
- How did the family abuse her? (Is her claim true or false? Need details to confirm it.)
- Who made the first move after all of these years? Why?
- Why did Shelley take her parents to Canada? Couldn't she and her brother take care of the parents in California? Why didn't she keep her brother informed about her plans to take their parents to Canada? (Did she intend to isolate them and take advantage of them?)
- After the business failed, where were her parents? Did she leave them alone? Is that why she sent for her brother? (Need to establish her motives again for wanting to be near them again.)

- What did the brother steal? How much? Did she file a report? Why didn't she ever discuss this with him? (Need to establish her credibility or lack of.)
- Why is she trying to see her father without her brother's knowledge? (In order to isolate him from the brother again? She knows the brother has the Power of Attorney for both parents.)

What were/are the brother's circumstances in connection to his parents? I.e. Are the parents safe in his hands? How does he manage on his own?

- Was the brother working when he lived in California?
- Who was taking care of the parents in California? Did they need care at the time? Were they able to manage on their own? (Need to establish reason the parents were moved to Canada.)
- How near did the brother live to the parents? How close was he to them? How did he not know that his sister was moving them to California? (Did Shelley take advantage of an opportunity here where the parents could not reach out to Michael for his help? Were the parents not allowed to talk to him or tell him?)
- Does the brother appear to be stressed as a caregiver? (What is the status of their care? Is the mother in any danger being in his care?)

What is the parent's side of the story? (Is there a reason why the parents have now disowned her again? Is she a danger to them still?)

- Shelley said she was thrown out at age 16 years? Why? Was it because she didn't mow the lawn that day? Really?
- Why were Social Workers involved when Shelley was being kicked out of the home? (Are her claims against her parents false? Was she actually abusive with them?)
- What was Shelley like up until 8 years of age? After she found out she was adopted?
- How was she treated by the family?
- How did Shelley happen to be in California after so many years of absence?
- How did they feel about her presence in California?
- Did they feel pressured to sell their home and leave California?
- How were they treated by Shelley during the moving process?
- How did Shelley treat her parents after they settled in Canada but before the brother arrived?
- What happened when the business failed? Trace Shelley's steps until she left them again.

What is the parents standard of care at the present time? (Support Workers and the nurses at the long term facility should be interviewed.)

- How are the parents being cared for?
- What about the estate? Is there a will?

- How are the expenses being covered?
- What are the living conditions like in the apartment?

Other people or groups that should be interviewed (It would not only open the communication between all parties concerned but also establish a safety net for both the parents and the brother by keeping everyone informed in the event Shelley does make an attempt to take advantage of her disabled parents):

- Nurses at the long term facility
- Support workers that visit the household everyday
- Michael's circle of friends, neighbours
- Shelley's daughter, friends, neighbours
- Family's legal representatives

Is there any future danger?

- Shelley is keeping an eye on the family discreetly. The brother wasn't even aware of this. This is a concern.
- Is there any intent to sabotage the brother's relationships that he has with Support Workers or the nurses by making unfounded claims against him? (It would leave him alone and unable to care for his mother. Again it would be a way of isolating the mother from her brother if she can manage it.)
- Is she trying to wear down her sibling by not helping him take care of the mother? Why does Shelley constantly push for her mother to be put in LTC? (Would it give her another opportunity to isolate her and get control of the parent's financial affairs?)
- Why did Shelley send her daughter to check on her father? Why didn't she go visit herself? She calls the hospital to get information instead. (Does Shelley not want anyone in the family to know that she's trying to get near her father?)

Good questions to keep in mind to help keep focused

What do you mean?

What are you saying? OR What aren't you saying / telling me?

Could you give me an example?

The investigation of Emotional Elder Abuse is a long and arduous process but a necessary one. Perpetrators of Emotional Elder Abuse are masters at manipulation and although their methods and strategy are simple in foundation, they do produce convoluted results that allow them to operate quite freely while no one suspects them.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

This material is protected by copyright. No part of it may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of the author, nor be circulated in any other form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published.

For other inquiries please contact:
guntakrumins@yahoo.com