

**PSYCHOTHERAPY OFF THE WALL**

(or Proclivities of a Psychotherapist Made Indefensible)

by

Felicity Alice Constance True

**To** our alleged patients

**Acknowledgement** is gratefully made of the editorial help generously given by Judy Bridge who, in the face of all reason, judgement and odds, tried to make this patently fictional material believable, plausible, sensible and possibly comprehensible. Her heroic efforts were doomed from...the start.

## PREFACE

I know you know that psychotherapy is a terribly serious and expensive enterprise, that it delves painfully into the deep unconscious horrors which drive people to crime and to drink, and that the person who needs it most is "the other guy" -- although you may sometimes wonder about yourself. I know you know that one of the problems encountered with psychotherapists is that they use their own language which nobody understands. Have you ever wondered if it's just to hide the fact that they don't know what they're talking about? If they did, you'd think they'd realize that what they do is meaningless since it's obvious that you can't have a scientific enterprise whose subject matter is ephemeral behaviour governed by an individual's free will.

Actually, psychotherapy can be terrific fun for all concerned. It can be quite inexpensive. It can ignore the unconscious -- if that exists in the form in which most people think of it. It does address pains, but mostly to get rid of them. Almost nobody has to become a crook or an addict. Almost everybody can benefit from psychotherapy. It's just a way to provide relevant assistance to solve resistant problems which don't yield to help from friends, clergy or physicians. It's true that, as in any enterprise, there are some practitioners who don't know which side is up (or out). But the use of specialized languages is intended to create greater precision than could be achieved using the often ambiguous and non-referential words of everyday language. And it sometimes happens that adopting the language helps treatment. Finally, you can make science of Psychology and of psychotherapy, even acknowledging free

will. Some of the bases for these statements should become clearer as you make your way through the text.

But why bother saying all this? Partly it's to pique your interest. Partly it's to question some common stereotypical misconceptions about psychotherapy, some of which may be due to exposure to inadequately trained therapists. Partly it's intended to explain why Psychologise is used at times in this volume in addition to English. Partly it's to create confusion with contradictory statements -- uncertainty is necessary if new learning or understanding is to take place. And finally it's because a book is supposed to have a preface, whose purpose is to mislead you into thinking you know what the volume is about. So let's mislead you in the usual way. This volume seeks to offer some solid information about psychotherapy, disguised as light-hearted science fiction, carried out by an odd psychotherapist trying to solve psychological mysteries of crime and addiction as if he was a defective on the police farce.

This paragraph is intended to pursue the fourth purpose listed in the last paragraph. ... If the foregoing failed to pique your interest, this preface has succeeded in doing what, in my view, prefaces usually do. If it captured your interest, and thus failed to succeed-by-failing, perhaps you read the wrong preface. The real Preface to this work is the Introduction. So maybe you should read it. If you don't, you will have helped to make this preface a success in being the failure prefaces are supposed to be. And you will, willy nilly, have contributed to creating this volume -- and you wouldn't want to have that held against you, would you?

## CONTENTS

Preface ...	ii
Contents ...	iv
Re-Introduction ... Funny Things Funny People Do	x
PART I: Sexual Offenses	
Introduction	
Chapter 1. Rape, the Delight of the Media	
Introduction	
An Absolute Absolution	
A Victimized Victimizer	
An Importuned Opportunist	
A Repugnant Pugilist	
A Vicious Vileness	
Chapter 2. Incest, Creating New Scars	
Introduction	
Chapter 3. A-sexuality -- Exhibitionism & Sadism	113
Introduction -- Untruly True	
A Flagging Flasher	
A Much Maligned Marquis	
A Surreptitious Sadist	
A Total Totalitarian	
A Wired Pyro	
Chapter 6. Criminality -- Guilt Intolerance	173
Chapter 8. Violence -- Intolerable Irritability	202

## RE-INTRODUCTION

### Funny Things Funny People Do

Whenever I meet someone, it seems only proper to introduce myself before I expect the other person to divulge much about him or her self. As you read and react in your own special way to each of the stories about which I plan to gossip, it seems likely that you will reveal a good deal about yourself -- to yourself. So it seems only right that I should begin by telling you something about myself and about the rather improbable protagonist in this set of mystery stories. Bear with me while I do that.

I am the protagonist's spouse. Since the protagonist's name is Felicity, you might expect me to be her husband. Actually, I'm his wife. What makes it more confusing is that we both have the same name. That's right, I came equipped with the same given names as he did. Now that is an unlikely coincidence. I keep wondering what the probabilities are that two people, each with three given names which are the same, would meet and marry. Can you imagine how strange it feels to greet your spouse with: 'Felicitations, Felicity', only to hear the echo: 'Felicitations, Felicity'? Well, that's what it's like at our house.

If you would like to hear a bit more about Felicity's history and what it's like at our house, you might want to peak at the Introduction to the earlier volume, Psychotherapy Beyond the Fringe. Oh, you didn't know there was another volume. Well there is. That first volume in this series was concerned with some of the attempts Felicity made to treat people for the usual kinds of 'mental' or 'emotional' conditions for which people usually seek

psychotherapy. This, second, volume is about Felicity's attempts to use the methods of psychotherapy to treat criminals and addicts. I know, it makes no sense to try to use psychotherapy with addicts and criminals. After all, criminal conduct is due to genetic and economic factors and it has nothing whatever to do with the things with which psychotherapy is concerned. And addictions have to do with genetic factors and the chemical composition of the body, and again have nothing to do with psychotherapy. Anyway that's what I said. But Felicity just shrugged his shoulders and carried on talking about psychotherapy with criminals and addicts just as though there was nothing about which to object. So, in telling these stories, I have called them Psychotherapy Off the Wall.

Incidentally, as if these stories weren't silly enough, he also told me a bunch of stories about things that clearly can have nothing at all to do with psychotherapy. These concerned people with physical diseases and irreversible brain damage. So I've entitled them, Psychotherapy Out of Bounds. They've got to be just plain nuts.

But let's get back to Felicity and repeat some of the last volume's Introduction just to show you how crazy he is. Of course, his initials did help to shape his destiny. It was inevitable he'd become a physicist or an engineer. So, naturally, he became a psychologist. And, naturally again, being destined for a career in the 'hard' sciences, he became a psychotherapist.

How that came about is easy to understand. I don't know about you, but Felicity hated school. But he hated the thought of having to work even more. So, upon completing high school, he found an

expedient way to postpone the need for the employment market to find suitable work for him. He registered in university. Then he was faced with another problem. He was chronically confused about who or what he was. So he had no idea which of the available courses of study to pursue. Providentially, to support the indecision of the indecisive, the university had an entry programme in Arts which served as the first year for a host of disciplines. He enrolled in this entry programme and chose courses with the help of a dart board and a set of dice. One of the courses he carefully selected by these means was Psychology. It was in this course that he found the discipline most suited to his nature.

As he explains it, he had learned everything he cared to know about health in high school, where he was taught an assortment of useful things such as: 'Flies spread disease; keep yours closed'. He had learned everything he cared to know about crime by hearing that 'if it wasn't for pickpockets, some people would have no sex life at all'. And he had learned everything he cared to know about addictions by trying his first cigarette, hating it, and becoming completely addicted to the weed. Now, only in his first year at university, he was taught the rest of what he felt he needed to know -- that 'Psychology is the study of the id by the odd'.

Although he had attended the world's most advertised school (you know, everywhere you go you see its sign: 'Slow School'), he was quick enough to see at once the discipline he was destined to follow. It occurred to him in the twinkling of an eye (or a twitch of the nose) that he would someday be doing in his own odd way the funny things with the id that those funny psychologist people do.

In the course of a long career, replete with improbable experiences, he encountered many strange events and a great many wonderful people. Most of these people managed to effect almost miraculous changes in themselves during the time in which they allowed him the privilege of peeping into their lives. Of course, he never had the slightest idea about how they performed their feats. But, because they impressed him so much, it had always distressed him that their accomplishments could not be shared with others. Unfortunately, nobody would believe most of the stories he could tell about these people, even if they were recounted face to face, and even if the listeners were the closest of friends. So he had resigned himself to the fact that these improbable events were never to be recorded.

However, a friend and colleague who, like me, was enamoured of the tales, and who was concerned lest Felicity's final breath might be drawn without some of these fanciful stories seeing the light of day, concocted with conviction the original form of the Principle of Perversity (Felicitations, 1980, 1, 1, 1-2). He pointed out that, human nature being as perverse as it is, it is much easier for people to believe that which is patently fictitious than it is to believe that which is presented as fact. Why not, he suggested, write up the cases as the pure fiction they obviously are, without Felicity's usual attempts to make them sound plausible? Then everybody could believe them. He added that if Felicity felt it necessary to expound profound truisms and assorted meaningless justifications about what was supposed to have taken place or about how the effects noted might be explained, he might choose to expand

at length on the tales in a companion work. In this way, it would be possible to make reading about psychotherapy tolerable, even silly, while at the same time introducing students to the demanding discipline of psychotherapy with the least possible pain.

Accordingly, this is one of another pair of improbable works of fiction. This one contains yarns about more people who never existed, identified by their real fictitious names. Of course it must follow that any resemblance between these people and anybody living or dead, or even eventually to be alive or dead, is purely and completely accidental and unintentional. The companion work, aptly entitled A Second Companion's Work, which contains all the associated clutter of irrelevant thoughts, unlikely schemes and fantastic fictional and pseudo-scientific explanations, all being expressed in the pedantic and mind-destroying forms of nonsense and non-communication commonly used by psychologists, you will be happy to hear, is not going to be written. You may be less happy to hear that its contents are contained instead under the covers of this volume, although frequently in chapter introductions.

By now I must have only modestly obscured the fact that one aim of this work is to formulate psychotherapy fiction under the guise of science. Which brings us to the topic of science.

Of course, everybody knows that science is a process by which statements (called hypotheses or theories) are tested for their truth or validity. Although normally based upon fairly firm grounds (usually stated in a scientific report), an 'hypothesis' is a guess, the truth or validity of which is to be tested in an experiment. The hypo-thesis is a little thesis or a sub-complete

(less than complete) theory. As the statement or little theory to be tested in any experiment, the hypothesis is the central and organizing idea which selects what is to be tried out. What marks these stories as being off the wall (or beyond the fringe) is not only their manifestly fictional character, but also the fact that the hypotheses tested are often a trifle unusual. They sometimes even get to be quite strange.

Also, in experimental tests of hypotheses, a plurality of individuals or observations is usually included in order to avoid the pitfall of drawing a mistaken conclusion due to chance peculiarities of one particular individual or observation. In clinical work, it may be impractical to employ more than one case in a given experiment. So it is accepted practice to do 'single case' studies. However, when single case methods are used, it is considered inappropriate to draw widely generalized conclusions from them referring to whole populations of events or people. For this reason, where convenient, two or more case stories are fabricated here to illustrate the possibility that the conclusions dreamed up may be suitable for generalization to large populations. How's that for a way to get around a methodological problem!?

Let me repeat something I else I said in the earlier book. While reading these stories, you may wonder why a loving wife (which I am) could offer the 'put downs' of her husband contained in some of these pages. I have simply recorded the stories in the way in which Felicity told them to me. He has an off way of speaking about himself, as though he was embarrassed about talking well of himself. Since I found his way of referring to himself to

be funny, I have recorded them here in the hope that you will be able to enter in the light-hearted banter too.

Finally, may I add a note of welcome to these pages. I would invite those, such as yourself, possessed of virtue, integrity, honesty, calculated scientific reserve and tutored critical faculty, to explore these pages. A little harmless fiction never hurt anyone. It might even poke a few holes in the blinkers with which we all restrict and fashion the world to fit our own pre-conceptions. What you will find here is a set of mystery stories in which hypothetical solutions are generated and examined through treatment outcomes to provide means by which one rather peculiar psychologist might create imaginary structure for himself to help him cope -- you may think in a crazy way -- in the confusing enterprise of trying to understand people and to help them to fix their deformed or broken worlds through psychotherapy. These particular stories have to do with criminals and addicts.

Felicity Alice Constance True 0-I-X (you pick the number\*)

-----  
\* (This is the only footnote.) "0" stands for hugs. "X" stands for kisses. "I" won't stand for any of that sort of stuff. "I" prefer "/" to "\_\_" recline. But enjoy the rest, footnote-and-fancy-free.

## PART I

### Sexual Offenses

#### Introduction

If you are going to talk about psychology, there is a rule (maybe an unwritten one) that you have to start right off talking about sex. Partly, this is because many people think that that's all psychotherapists think about. And maybe some do. Partly, this common misconception comes about because many people don't know that psychology has advanced a long way past Freud's (a dirty old man who fathered psychotherapy) pre-scientific grasp of what people are about. Partly, the notions about sex in life come from other dirty old and young men and women who haven't discovered that life holds out any other kinds of fun. Partly, the idea about the importance of sex comes from everybody's vicarious pleasure from talking and thinking about it. In any case, one just has to start off by talking about sex, if only to get people's attention.

But what is there to say about sex which is not just the same old stuff that people have been talking about for centuries, and which psychotherapists have been getting other people to talk about for decades? You might think that everything interesting about it has already been said. So we might have to get our vicarious oral gratifications from chewing over stuff that other people have talked about at some length. Let's see.

## Chapter 1

### Rape! The Delight of the Media

#### Introduction

Of course, the most sensational subject to talk about is rape. Most people seem to have the idea that rape is a sexual act which just happens to involve violence in order to achieve the sexual purpose. In fact, it looks more as though rape is a violent act which just happens to involve the genitals to achieve its angry or aggressive purpose. But even this is not always true. Oh dear, now we are going to get confused if we aren't careful. Actually, of course, nothing is quite as simple as we often try to make it out to be. And remember, one of the purposes of this discourse on psychotherapy is to try to make some sense out of the things that happen in people and the things which make life go badly for some people -- in this case, particularly the victims.

So what is rape about? Well, that depends on who is doing the rape, and to whom. For example, rape by a convict on a fellow prisoner is likely partly a sexual act, though it is likely also (more) motivated by a need to dominate another. Date rape is also usually motivated partly by sex, but it is also (possibly more so) motivated by anger over frustrated wishes and/or a self-righteous sense of 'rights' or 'possession' over the other. Rape of a stranger is likely motivated by sexual wishes and fantasies, but it seems commonly to be also (more) a product of such issues as anger about too strong guilt feelings, sadistic fantasies of the other's helplessness, the wish to punish another as perceived retribution

for a sense of personal injury, the felt need to control another, or just plain violent rage due to other events in the rapist's life. There are several possible factors involved in rape. It is for this reason that several stories are concocted in this chapter to address some of the imagined reasons why rape occurs.

Before telling these stories, however, a couple of things need to be said and understood. First, there is risk that talking about rape and rapists will lead one to imagine that rape is as common an event as the media seem to suggest. That can increase people's fears about being raped. Rape is still a relatively very rare event, and the media have done us a real disservice by barraging us with accounts of it and other sensational events, and thus making it seem that such events are commonplace. Second, some people will be offended by the consideration which may seem to be afforded in these stories to the perpetrator and his feelings. It needs to be understood that Felicity never met these perpetrator's victims, so he has been protected from direct exposure to the pains which they suffered. Also, he had to treat the perpetrators in order to try to prevent victimization of other people in the future. In order to be able to do that he has had to prevent himself from critical or hostile attitudes toward these people and, in fact, to foster in himself positive feelings toward them. It took me quite a while to be able to adjust to this fact in listening to his stories about this kind of criminal offence. Third, Felicity has to present the perpetrators as fairly ordinary people (which, if fact, they are) since, when he succeeded in the work he did with them, they returned to the community as ordinary people with an ordinary and

decent concern with the well-being of others -- and not in any sense more dangerous than anybody else. So, while understanding that we too feel horror about their crimes, please try to bear with the way in which we may talk about these offenders.

### A Victimized Victimizer

There is a growing lore to the effect that most, or at least many, sex offenders have been the victims of sexual abuse when they were children. Certainly, lots of sex offenders report such abuse in their early lives. However, there is growing evidence that many of the alledged instances of child sexual abuse never happened. These instances are created either intentionally to justify the perpetrator's own actions, or unintentionally as a result of the effort to understand the roots of personal distress or absent early memories. Before talking about Allen, it might be well to take a few moments to explain the false memories some people possess.

Sex offenders, as a group, are among those who failed to achieve adequate socialization as young people. They often don't know things like how to talk to people, how to court or how to express their feelings. After they have performed a sex offence they are often terribly ashamed of themselves. Like most of us, when they feel ashamed they are likely to try to find some way to explain what they did.

Some of their explanations can be quite imaginative, and others can be just plain silly. One of the explanations which seems satisfactory to some of them is that they themselves were sexually abused as children. Quite often the reports of this childhood sex abuse amount to little more than elaborations about

the normal consensual exploration of one another's bodies which occurs during preschool and early school years. Sometimes the reports appear to be attempts to make sense out of memories of childhood phantasms -- early dreams remembered partly because they seemed real and because they made no sense at the time. And some of the reports are of real events of childhood sexual misadventures or sexual abuse by older people. The latter lend credence to some of the other stories in the eyes of people working with offenders.

The more insidious false memories, however, stem from two other sources. When we become upset or troubled, most of us try to find ways in which to understand or explain why. Since most of us look for causes in the past (i.e., 'initial causes'), like Freud, we feel forced to poke back farther and farther into our histories to find the causes in forgotten or buried painful events. Absent memories seem to confirm that there must be something buried. This can happen, but the chances are that the memories were never stored for retrieval in the first place. There are at least two ways in which this can happen.

Most people don't have 'real' memories before three or four years of age. The reason for this is that memories are stored as images which are cued by words. Prior to three or four years of age the child just doesn't have enough verbal language to store memories effectively for retrieval at a later date. So most of the really early memories some people report are pseudo-memories most likely recreated at a later age by stories told by other older family members or incautious questioning or acceptances by other confidants, or even psychotherapists -- who may listen for the

things they consider 'important', or to which they are sensitive or they think accounts for other people's experiences or distresses.

Many people complain that they can't remember anything of their childhoods, and they may conclude that this means they have buried something terrible. Most of these people date their first memories from between nine and eleven years of age. When this happens the reason is nearly always the same. Either due to felt conflict with parents, or due to fairly intense introversion, the child has refrained from much verbal interaction with older family members. During the early 'self-conscious' years of life (about three to nine) the child has very little history with which to contend or to create backward-looking thoughts. The present and the anticipated future (when he/she will be able to do this or that) is about all the child is concerned with. By about 10, two things happen: the child has enough history to make it appropriate, even necessary, to date the past in an historical sequence, and he/she develops a greater involvement with peers than with parents, and feels the need for a sense of his/her identity (differences and similarities) with respect to his/her peers. In the 'normal' course of development, the dating of past events ('how old was I when ...'), and its resultant sense of continuity of identity, is provided in conversations with parents and older siblings. In those young people who do not participate actively in communication with older family members (due to conflict or introversion), the memories of the past fail to be dated so that it often seems to them that their childhood memories date only back to the point of intense social consciousness or peer involvements -- at about ten.

The memories are there, they just have not become organized in memory in an age-related time sequence.

Allen was sentenced to prison on a conviction for rape. He was extremely embarrassed about his action, and he was terrified about what the other inmates might do to harm him. He had heard how sex offenders could be treated in prison, both by the staff and the other inmates who mutually tended to view sex offenders as the lowest form of vermin, and who frequently abused or injured them. Although he was a solidly built young man in his late twenties, he tended to stand in corners or walk near walls, watching the other inmates furtively and trembling visibly.

His offence began with a break and enter committed when he was drunk and doing drugs. He was looking for money or anything he could sell to allow him to buy more drugs. In the apartment he entered, he found a young woman asleep in her bed. He tripped over something and the woman was awakened by the noise. She was clearly scared, but she was also angry and she began to scream. He ran to the bed, grabbed her around the shoulders with one arm, covered her mouth with his other hand and whispered a warning that she had better not make any noise. In holding her, he pulled her up from the bed and the covers fell away showing her naked body. She grabbed the covers and tried to cover herself with them.

Allen liked the sight of her body, and he was half aware that the woman seemed more concerned that her nudity be covered than that he was holding her or that he had threatened her. When he had obtained her nodded assent that she would make no noise, he took his hand away from her mouth and pulled the covers down to look at

her body again. Although she had not struggled with his hand on her mouth, she fought to keep herself covered. Partly due to the effects of the alcohol and drugs which disinhibited some of the anger he had harboured toward his parents, partly due to feeling frustrated at being unable to wrestle the covers from the woman's grip, and partly due to his awareness of her sense of vulnerability about her nudity, Allen began to feel a towering rage building in himself. It built very quickly.

He was wearing a scarf. He pulled it off and tied it around the woman's head to act as a gag. She released the sheets and tried to remove the gag. He grabbed her arms, pushed them behind her back and used a blouse on her night table to tie them behind her. He pulled the bedding off her. She tried to struggle. He took hold of her breasts and pressed her into the bed. The woman winced. For a moment he hesitated reacting to her discomfort. But his anger took over and he began brutally to maul her genitals. He might still have stopped with the manhandling, but she looked as though she was terrified. A dark image crept into his mind which involved some intense excitement. He felt tense all over, and his excitement got the better of him. He hit her hard a couple of times to warn her to be still. Then he clambered out of his trousers and raped her viciously.

While telling Fellicity this story, Allen wept often. He said he knew he had hurt her, scared her and injured her. He said he felt awful remorse about what he did. But, like many offenders, he seemed almost more preoccupied with 'why' he did such a thing than about his victim's suffering. He moved easily to that question.

Allen complained that he had no clear memories at all before the age of eleven, but that he was sure he had been sexually abused as a child -- why else would he have no childhood memories? Almost as a plea, he asked whether any early sexual abuse he may have suffered would account for 'why' he abused this woman. He was not really interested in Fellicity's opinion on the matter. He was sure that must be why he did this terrible thing. But Fellicity was quick enough to notice that there was no other explanation offered, even one to tie such possible abuse of himself to his abuse of his victim.

This story is told in considerable detail because it illustrates quite well several of the common features found in sex offenses. Commonly, there has been use of disinhibiting substances, there is a sudden opportunity which was at least not entirely expected (if it had been expected, controls might have been in place before the opportunity presented itself), the victim is alone and vulnerable, the surroundings are dark (making anonymity possible), parts of the person's body can be seen unclothed, the victim seems helpless or terrified, the victim seems submissive or acquiesces to demands, the perpetrator has felt angry at abuse or mistreatment he/she believes to have been given to him/her, the perpetrator has justifications or excuses available in his/her mind to serve as an additional disinhibitor, and there is usually a progression of changing plans or purposes which unfold as the act proceeds often changing from one set of intentions and actions to others. These are some of the elements which may lead to dangerous behaviours. Fortunately, Allen believed that it was dark enough in

the room that the woman would be unable to recognize and identify him. If he had realized that his features could be seen quite clearly, the situation might have shifted from a dangerous one to a lethal one.

An Importuned Opportunist

A Repugnant Pugilist

A Vicious Vileness

Chapter 2

Incest, Creating New Scars

Introduction

An Absolute Absolution

### **Chapter 3**

#### **A-sexuality -- Exhibitionism & Sadism**

##### **Introduction -- Untruly True**

Felicity is strange. Surely exhibitionism and sadism are sexual phenomena, if anything associated with intensified sexual drive. Maybe, and maybe not. Perhaps Felicity is living up to his 'odd' psychologist nature in believing that they are probably more like rape, which is an aggressive act and not a sexual one. That

does not mean that sexual arousal is not involved in exhibitionism, rape or sadism. It often is. But the sexual motives are infantile and essentially pre-sexual. And the excitement generated by them probably only includes sexual arousal as part of a complex pattern of arousal involving all sorts of other needs or drives -- anger, power, dependency and the like.

How do we know these facts? We don't. Felicity just made them up. Of course, a lot of other people think the evidence points that way too. But just let's see if we can glean anything from the cases presented, such as they are -- admittedly, not a representative bunch if, indeed, there is such a thing.

### **A Flagging Flasher**

Felicity heard about George years before he met him. A pair of colleagues treated George for his exhibitionism using Wolpe's systematic desensitization method almost ten years before Felicity and he met. Apparently, there had been a slight reduction in the frequency of his exhibitionistic acts following the systematic desensitization, a reduction which lasted for about three months. But the frequency of 'flashing' had quickly returned to its former rate -- a rate that varied between one and four or more times per day when he was not incarcerated. A psychiatrist characterized George as the most malignant and intractable case of exhibitionism ever recorded in the literature.

From the time when he was treated with the desensitization, George had been carried by the psychiatrist of the team, who had tried 'every known form of therapy' with George, ranging from

intensive psychotherapy to aversive conditioning. Since the psychiatrist was moving his practice, he transferred the case to another psychiatrist who, upon reviewing the treatment provided this man, determined that the only thing that hadn't been tried yet was something out of Felicity's bag of tricks. Consequently, George was referred to Felicity for treatment.

Felicity listened to George's story. The man was clearly desperate. He disliked his compulsion to exhibit himself, and not just because it regularly landed him in jail. He had accepted every kind of indignity in order to free himself of his actions. He had even accepted his wife playing the role of custodial officer. To prevent his misdeeds, she accompanied him everywhere, including to and from work. He still managed to elude her daily in all sorts of clever ways in order to perform his act.

Unlike most exhibitionists Felicity had known, George did not give himself the justification that he only wanted to give pleasure to the ladies to whom he exposed himself. His psychotherapy and his frequent experiences in court had disabused him of that idea. Besides, the treatments he had received also included covert sensitization -- a modern way of treating exhibitionists. In this method he had been induced to image the guilt and shame he felt in court when his unacceptable acts were being described in detail in public. As soon as he was feeling the guilt and shame strongly enough, he was then required to exhibit himself to a female staff member. This 'cold' exhibitionistic act, repeated many times, had not reduced his exhibitionistic frequency a bit. It was not that he wanted to do the act, nor did he report much pleasure or arousal

in it. He felt compelled to do the act.

Believing, on the basis of the tests administered to George, that there was a negative, anxiety-mediated, arousal at the root of his compulsive actions, Felicity started George on Quirk's stimulus conditioned autonomic response suppression (SCARS) method (described in greater detail later). Galvanic skin resistance (GSR) electrodes were attached to George's right hand to record moment to moment changes in his palmar sweat response -- as one way of measuring activity of the autonomic-emergency-stress-anxiety nervous system. Meanwhile, George was shown pictorial slides, mostly representing people in various stages of undress, usually in public or looking as though they were embarrassed by being thus unclothed. The purpose of the pictures was to evoke in George ideas related to mild embarrassment associated with being seen by others in various ways 'exposed' to public scrutiny -- the feelings usually associated with shame. Strange and contradictory as this may seem, the idea was to desensitize or decondition (get rid of) his uncomfortable arousal or shame. Every time, as soon as the GSR recorded a 1,000 ohms increase (less sweat) beyond its former levels, the slide George was looking at was changed. In this method, slide change (not slide content) was used as if it were a 'reward' for the increase in skin resistance (less sweat, more 'comfort') as measured by the GSR. The idea was to train George's physiological anxiety responses toward comfort in the situations represented by the slides -- hopefully to reduce the associated uncomfortable feelings he might experience in such situations.

His wife continued to accompany George everywhere, as she had

for the past many years. The treatment seemed interminable to George. It actually lasted three months, at the (maximum) frequency of three sessions a week. There were thirty-five sessions in all. There was no discussion of his exhibitionistic acts. As the treatment was reaching its planned end, Felicity was surprised when, upon inquiry, George said that his exhibitionistic acts had stopped about a month previously. Of course Felicity was a little sceptical, but he thought he would not press the issue too much as George would eventually be in court and in jail again if he was not telling the truth.

Treatment was concluded according to plan, and follow-up visits were arranged monthly. At the first follow-up visit, George reported that there had been no 'flashing' now for a bit more than two months. As if to confirm this, George had attended the session not wearing manacles and without an escorting correctional officer waiting for him. Felicity congratulated him, another appointment was made for a month away, and they parted.

Just before the next planned session, George phoned Felicity in a panic. He said, "It's happened again." There was genuine despair in his voice. Felicity suggested that they could talk about it at their planned session in a few days time. When George appeared for that appointment, he carried on his face a mixture of self-depreciation and wonderment. He said he had indeed exposed himself on the one occasion a few days earlier, but he had not felt compelled to repeat the action since. Felicity decided to respond in a matter-of-fact and supportive way, and he encouraged George to 'forget about it'. George thought Felicity was out of his mind and

told him so. Felicity shrugged and said, "Probably."

Of course, George could not know what was behind Felicity's lack of concern. Felicity had observed two interesting things about people who were undergoing the SCARS procedure which he had used with George. First, if the frequency of sessions was such that there was less than 48 hours between sessions (i.e., sessions held daily), it tended to take almost a half again as many sessions to complete the basic anti-anxiety treatment task as it did if there was at least 48 hours between sessions. He had concluded that what is called 'short-term consolidation' of learning requires about 48 hours. So, with those people seen daily, short-term consolidation of the learning from one session was not yet complete before the learning from the next session was introduced. This may have been why treatment was 'slowed down' in these cases.

Second, he had noticed something else which was more relevant to George's current situation. Following completion of this kind of treatment, at about six week intervals, many people reported a temporary recurrence of their symptoms. The recurrence was often accompanied by an increased intensity of reported anxiety or distress. Felicity had concluded from this observation that long-term consolidation of learning must take about 6 weeks. He thought that new learning must be stored in temporary memory for a while. At some point in time (perhaps after 6 weeks), the brain's executive function decides that the new learning is appropriate, and that it should become part of the long-term habit storage system. At this point, the new learning is probably 'dumped' into the more or less permanent organization of behaviour, which is

called personality. But the existing structure of habits in the personality would be somewhat inconsistent with the new learning, for example, from treatment. Consequently, the personality would have to re-adjust itself and its motivational force fields to accommodate the new learning. This action should involve a general disruption of the organization of the personality system. This disruption might well be experienced as distress, and might well allow old habits to re-appear temporarily, particularly if they were anxiety-related.

Given this way of looking at the process of consolidation of new therapeutic learning, Felicity was not surprised to observe a periodic re-emergence of symptoms. And, in fact, it was even reassuring to him when it occurred. But it had been about two months -- that is, more than six weeks -- since George and Felicity had terminated their treatment work together. Didn't that bother Felicity? Not really. Felicity had no idea at all about when to start counting off the 6-week intervals. With the benefit of 20/20 hind-sight, Felicity was ready to argue to himself that the treatment had really been completed when George, unbeknown to Felicity, had stopped exposing himself. And that had now been about three months ago, or an interval equal to two six-week long-term consolidation periods.

Although troubled by Felicity's capricious nonchalance about his criminal behaviour, George accepted the reassurance that Felicity was not worried and went home. They completed their follow-up interviews together a little short of the planned two years. There were no further incidents reported during that time,

and George remained out of court and out of jail.

As if to tell Felicity that the termination of the follow-up was premature, just after it was completed and almost exactly two years following the last incident, George phoned Felicity again in a panic. "It's all over me again," he moaned. Felicity invited him in for another interview.

George looked scared and despondent when he appeared for the session a couple of days later. Felicity asked him what had happened. He said his wife had stopped accompanying him everywhere about a year perviously, since he had not exposed himself for a long time. He was driving home from work on Friday. He saw a woman walking on the side walk. He parked in a lane way ahead of her and, when she passed the lane, he stepped out and exposed himself. But he was not sure that she had seen him as she did not react in any way. He drove on until he reached a shopping mall. He parked and got out of his car, found a couple of women and exposed himself again. He was sure they saw him this time. Then he felt overwhelmed by panic. He leaped into his car, drove home as fast as he could, ran in and hid under the bed.

Felicity wanted to laugh at the image this account painted in his mind, but the fact that he was still unsure about why this incident had occurred sobered him. He asked George whether he was suffering from any infectious illness -- he was not. He could see that George had not aged appreciably. He asked if he had been imbibing alcoholic beverages in any unusual quantities -- he had not. He asked if George was under any other acute source of stress -- he was not. He asked if George had been particularly tired.

That would have exhausted Felicity's intelligence about the conditions under which old habits are inclined temporarily to re-emerge. George acknowledged that he had been particularly tired. The incident in question had occurred while he was driving home on the Friday evening having just completed a week of double over-time shifts at work. Fatigue, and the above other factors, can reduce usual conscious controls, and can reinstate old habits temporarily.

Felicity breathed a sigh of relief and told George to go home and get some rest. George shook his head and stared at Felicity in disbelief. There was no doubt Felicity was mad. However, mad or sane, he felt he could trust Felicity, and he did as he was told.

Over the next few years, Felicity had periodic contact with George about matters concerning his family -- George and his wife had appointed Felicity as their family psychologist. During this time there were no further incidents of exhibitionism reported.

Eight years passed, and Felicity received yet another frantic phone call from George. "It's all over me again." He rushed over to see Felicity that day and reported that he had just exposed himself again on his way home from work. Felicity inquired into the above issues once more. There was nothing noteworthy in George's responses to the questions. There had been some family stressors during the past year, but nothing that Felicity considered to be relevant to the re-emergence of the old habit after so long a time.

The better to think about the problem, Felicity went to light up a cigarette and he offered one to George. George declined the offer politely. Felicity was taken aback by this refusal. He

remembered George to have been almost as heavy a smoker as he was. He thought George shared with Felicity one of the latter's lifelong objectives, namely, to burn up the products of those awful tobacco companies, usually one at a time in order to extend the period of the tobacco companies' suffering. He asked George when he had quit. George reported, with some pride, that he had quit three days earlier. Felicity gave a snort of disgust. "Get out of here!" he laughed. George was confused. What had he just said? Did Felicity want him to start smoking again? Was smoking a part of whatever had 'cured' his exhibitionism? Seeing George's sense of bewilderment, Felicity explained. The third day after quitting smoking is the point of maximum physiological stress and emotional disruption. The nicotine is just about out of the system, but there remains enough to create an increased craving for the poison. George was simply suffering a particularly strong physiological stress reaction, which would be gone by the next day.

George left. Although there have been further contacts about family matters, there has been no report of any exhibitionistic act. The last incident is now about 12 years old. In his own peculiar way, Felicity imagines there might be another recurrence in maybe four more years -- to represent the steady strengthening of the new habit and the decline of the old.

### **A Much Maligned Marquis**

Sexuality has had little to do with the compulsive 'flashing' acts of nearly all the exhibitionists Felicity has seen. Their sexual activities have usually been quite within normal limits with

one or many women, or as limited as that of many other men. This has been as true of males as of females -- although the latter may react sexually to the appreciative reactions of males, or in the anticipation of such reactions. To a slightly lesser extent, the same has been true of the transvestites (cross-dressers) Felicity has seen. The latter often do obtain some tactile sensations of an erotic nature from the softness of female clothing -- especially those who specialize in silks and satins. But this is largely from auto-sexual impulses, or the desire to enhance masturbatory sensations and fantasies. The major part of the transvestite image, whether in males or in females, seems to be one of social role adoption, largely associated with an exaggerated valuation of the sex role qualities of the other gender -- delicacy and refinement of taste, or aggressiveness and efficiency of movement.

Sadism is also quite distinct from sexuality, and really quite similar in its function to transvestism. Sadism's function appears to be that of the over-valuation of something akin to punishment. Everybody is capable of at least some sadism -- a sense of excitement (often misconstrued as satisfaction) in the helplessness of the other, best represented by the other's acceptance of pain. Most people, exposed to this view that sadism is widespread, reject the idea out of hand. Damn it, some people are just plain vicious and sadistic!

In fact, everybody has some sadistic impulses whether or not they ever get acted out. Sadistic acts usually express sadistic fantasies. And these may range all the way from inflicting pain or death on another, to revenge or 'getting back' at someone perceived

to have injured the avenger or hurt his feelings. Every day sadism rarely gets reported. It may involve fantasies of another's helplessness and suffering inflicted as if in retaliation (for example, the "Just you wait" song in "My Fair Lady"), vengeful reactions to perceived injury (next in degree of offence to a slight) and abuse (earlier generations' practices, methods of discipline or habits of ignoring another, reviewed, revised and updated).

Some people may feel offended about the apparently rather cavalier attitude adopted here toward, for example, abuse. By way of clarification, it should be stated that in most cultures acts such as murder, inflicting injury, and non-consensual sexual acts and sexual acts with children are considered to be crimes. There is no intention to imply here that crimes are acceptable in any terms. The point being made is that, the specific acts involved notwithstanding, the sadistic impulse which may serve to motivate some criminal and many non-criminal acts (or may never be acted out), is the same impulse, and is quite commonplace.

Following the second World War there was a good deal of concern about how quite nice people, such as large numbers of Germans, could apparently accept inflicting pain and degradation on other human beings -- as in the concentration camps. It was discovered that two factors were important: firstly, that the internees passively accepted the brutality inflicted upon them and, secondly, that the existing political attitudes permitted violence against them. It was this lethal combination which served to stimulate and release any sadistic feelings in those charged with

confining the internees. It was partly because of this discovery that the Israelis decided never again to 'sit back and take it' -- which may have led to at least some of the 'stiff necked' response of Israel to any sense of being victimized by others.

The way sadism works is well illustrated in an experiment. Zimbardo, a researcher at Stanford University, decided to find out what would happen if people became prisoners or guards. He advertised for students to serve as paid subjects in a research study. A bunch of nice college students volunteered. Zimbardo divided them at random into two groups, and assigned one group to serve as 'the prisoners' and the other group to serve as 'the guards'. A set of wooden cells was constructed in a research space, and the 'prisoners' were installed in the cells, with the 'guards' to look after them -- all in good, clean fun, right?

Well, the good clean fun turned out not to be fun at all. The prisoners, without prompting, started to act like prisoners. They became passive, submissive and accommodating. As if in response to these roles the prisoners were playing, the guards started to become exacting, demanding, demeaning and, yes, modestly sadistic. So profound were the changes which took place in the two groups of individuals that Zimbardo had to cancel the whole experiment within days. In fact one of the students playing the role of a prisoner became quite seriously disturbed in the experience. And similar kinds of observations have been made in a series of other studies trying to examine the same kind of thing.

There is no 'sexuality' involved in the development of the sadistic impulses on the part of those possessed of power, unless

the gender of the passive person coincides with that of the other's sexual object preference. However, it appears that it is not the sexualizing of the female which provokes sadism, any more than it is the sexualizing of the female which stimulates rape. Rape is usually an act of aggression, just as sadism is viewed by the perpetrator as an act of punishment, which is most likely to be acted out when the perpetrator is in a position of power over another (and typically harboured as angry ruminations when he or she is not). In the case where pain is to be inflicted on a member of the perpetrator's own gender, the action is most likely to be aimed at creating social disgrace, as by leaving visible marks by punching or scratching the other's face. In the case where the object of the aggression or of punishment is of the opposite gender, the reason why the genitals may sometimes be selected as a target of action is likely merely because they may seem to the perpetrator to be the part of the person most vulnerable to attack or to the evocation of pain or humiliation.

The point being made is that sadistic behaviour is involved in any intent to inflict pain or humiliation. The effects or the circumstances of the behaviour are, from the point of view of its sadistic intent, irrelevant to the nature of its motivation, even although we typically judge the behaviour in just those terms.

From the point of view of the actual behaviour or the circumstances or effects of the act, one may refer to it as 'an attack', or as an 'unprovoked act', or as having 'harmful' or 'dangerous' effects. The sadistic act nearly always involves an 'attack' (whether real or just imagined); it commonly (but not

always -- it may be intended as 'helpful punishment') has 'dangerous' or 'harmful' consequences (at least in its intent); but it is rarely considered to be 'unprovoked' in the eyes of the perpetrator -- even although nobody else may be able to understand the 'provocation'.

In the eyes of the perpetrator, any attack is deemed to be 'retaliatory' in nature, even if the act against which the retaliation is directed may not be detectable by others. Either internationally or individually, an attack is 'justified' by the attacker as if it were a response to having been provoked in the form of actual or imagined attack, intimidation, humiliation or misdeed. And the attacker's response is perceived by him or her (or it, if a nation) as the appropriate, and possibly even necessary, response in the face of the provocation -- if only to use the pain or humiliation as a means to draw the other's attention to his or her or its misdeed.

Most victims of sadistic attack would find the notion, that the attack was perceived as retaliation by the perpetrator, hard or impossible to understand or to accept. And, indeed, the provocation involved is often very nearly invisible. The attack may be conceived as a reaction to the other's aggressive stance, moral turpitude, former misdeeds, unfair advantages, invasiveness, faults, errors of judgement, or even attempts to achieve social empowerment (as through make-up, attire or manner). And, in order to act out sadistic impulses, the perpetrator usually views him/herself as morally or rightfully (eg., as a parent or an official) in the position of judging the other's apparent or real conduct.

And the sadistic response is not restricted to males. The response of the rape perpetrator or the sadist is really little different from that of a woman if she is going to fight with a man. She is likely to choose the groin as the most vulnerable point for attack. And, the intense excitement and sense of gratification which many women feel during training in rape-proofing, or in successful counter-attack when they are attacked, although it is called a sense of 'empowerment', is probably completely equivalent to the experience of sadism -- even although sadism has usually in the past been attributed almost exclusively to the male.

This point of view is certainly not a popular one. The most usual counter-arguments are that there is an important difference between attack and retaliation, that no attack is ever justifiable, and that the sense of 'empowerment' is a product of relief from fear of the anticipated danger in the situation. Unfortunately for these counter-arguments, the difference between attack and retaliation is largely that of the point of view of victim and perpetrator (which, of course, does not in any way justify any attack); although surely wrong, the perpetrator obviously does think of the attack as justified by his/her justification; and the experience of empowerment, far from being one of reduced distress (i.e., relief), is usually experienced as an increase in positive feelings approaching exhilaration. The whole point of this argument, of course, is not in any way to diminish the experience of any victim, but rather to remark that sadism, and particularly sadistic impulses, are common to almost everyone -- they are not qualitatively different events occurring in a number of particular

and anomalous people. That is, we all share in the experience of sadism in some degree, if only when we judge another's conduct and/or criticize or rebuke another.

Returning to a lighter vein, the Marquis de Sade never truly understood 'real' sadism. A real sadist is one who, without the social grace to make an excuse, refuses point blank to be mean to a masochist. Now, that is sadistic!

But the aggressive (rape) or punitive (sadism) 'retaliation' is not always directed at people. Its target is sometimes an object, to which the attacker attributes his or her sense of being demeaned, and on which he feels justified or permitted to inflict pain or damage. So it was no surprise to Felicity when, while reviewing his fantasies, he discovered that his patients Harry, Hector and Hugh, who most markedly evidenced sadism, were not involved at all in the expression of their sadism sexually, or toward people. Harry expressed his sadism toward animals, and Hector and Hugh expressed their sadism toward things.

### **A Surreptitious Sadist**

Harry, a man in his early thirties, was admitted to the correctional centre having been convicted of several counts of sadistically killing cattle. He had been employed as a farm labourer and thus had access to some cattle. The details of what he did are better left to your imagination, if you care to imagine such things. He had no sense that there was anything wrong with what he did. The dumb beasts were about as passive and yielding as anybody might wish.

On the Differential Diagnostic Technique (DDT), which was described in the story about Chester, Harry performed in the same way as Chester had done. This suggested that he had an irritative brain focus, equivalent to non-convulsive epilepsy, in the general region of the 'drive centre' of the old brain. Based on Chester's reaction, one might assume that it was the sex drive centre which was being accidentally and artificially stimulated in Harry's brain to evoke his sadistic behaviour. But there was no sexual involvement with the cattle he had killed, and Harry's sexual history was in no significant way different from that of any other 'normal' man. Instead, based on a history of sudden and unprovoked violent acts toward other children during his developmental years, it would seem more likely that it was Harry's 'rage' centre which was being stimulated by the short-circuiting activity involved in his 'complex seizures'.

And his fantasy life was replete with images or impulses of sadistic acts of various kinds, always with the victim being vulnerable, rendered incapable of self-protection and helpless. His fantasies had many of the staff genuinely fearful of what he would do after he was released from his current incarceration.

He was treated, for a total of forty half-hour sessions, with a biofeedback procedure based on the concurrent use of Sterman's EEG-SMR training method which had been used with Chester, and of Quirk's GSR-SCARS procedure which had been used with George. EEG electrodes were attached to his scalp near the C3-C4 site, and the EEG apparatus set to provide him with a whistling sound whenever and while there was evidence of sensorimotor rhythm (SMR) activity

from the site. The whistling sound was interpreted to him as being equivalent to Felicity saying 'fantastic' to him -- as a reward for producing some of the desired behaviour.

Galvanic skin resistance (GSR) electrodes were attached to his right hand to measure changes in his palmar sweat production while he was seated looking at pictorial slides. The slides were used to facilitate the transfer of the training from the lab to the world in which he lived, and they dealt with animals, people and things of various types and under various conditions -- that is, they were pretty neutral pictures from life. The role of the slides in the SCARS treatment, in addition to fostering transfer of training, was merely to allow something to occur at the 'right times' which could be used as discrete and contingent rewards -- the slide changes. Every time the GSR value increased by 1,000 ohms (i.e., less sweat, more 'calmness'), the slide was changed to a new one. He was told that slide change was Felicity's way of saying 'good' to him.

Shortly after the forty treatment sessions were completed, Harry was released, having satisfied his sentence. He returned to the community. Felicity has been 'pulling' Harry's cumulative correctional file from time to time over the six years since Harry was released to see whether he had received further charges or convictions. He has not. Assuming that he is still alive and resides, as he always had since birth, in the jurisdiction covered by these records, the record indicates that, to date, he has remained free from further offenses. This may represent something of an accomplishment for Harry, considering that he had not spent more than six months at a time on the street (i.e., not

incarcerated) since he had become an adult. Does this mean that Felicity's hypothesis was validated? It does not. Felicity regularly experiences some trepidation when he obtains Harry's file. Who knows if or when he will offend again?

### **A Total Totalitarian**

Now Hector was followed more closely by Felicity. Felicity met him when he too was admitted to the correctional centre. He was in his late teens, and he was considered to be a genuinely dangerous person at that age. Indeed, his remote community considered him sufficiently dangerous that they dispatched a police officer to the correctional centre when Hector was admitted. The officer brought with him a large, two-and-a-half inch thick file describing and picturing Hector's misdeeds, to supplement the information received through normal channels by the correctional centre's staff. Hardly in boyish exuberance, he had vandalized, trashed and torched a number of buildings including the school he was attending, several businesses and several houses of people he did not even know. On more than one occasion he had left in his wake a trail of destruction which might have mimicked a maelstrom. But he seemed indifferent to the fact and the extent of the damage he had done -- well, perhaps not indifferent, more like proud of his accomplishments.

Again, the DDT revealed the pattern of scores which Felicity had found repeatedly in deep, old brain, 'complex seizures' probably affecting the 'drive centre'. Again, it appeared from his recent, as well as his juvenile, history that the 'drive centre'

site implicated in the short-circuiting electrical stimulation, would be the 'rage' centre -- certainly, he had given many, many evidences of towering rages. Again it seemed appropriate to treat him in the biofeedback lab, using SMR conditioning of the EEG and the SCARS conditioning of the GSR, concurrently.

But there was something quite different about Hector. On the Eysenck test, his Extroversion score was at the first percentile point. That is, he would be thought of as very introverted, as only one percent of the population would score lower than he did on extraversion. This, in turn, would mean that he ought to learn new emotional habits very slowly -- that is, his conditionability would be very slow. Based on his experience with other patients undergoing the SCARS procedure, Felicity estimated that it would require as many as 125 half-hour treatment sessions to complete treatment with Hector. Without allowing for vacations and other sources of missed appointments, at the maximum frequency of twice per week that Felicity could afford, that would mean he would need sixty-three weeks, or sixteen months, to complete the treatment.

But Hector had only twelve months of sentence time left to serve when Felicity was ready to start treating him. Considering Hector's rather cavalier attitude toward his offenses, Felicity did not expect him to give up any of his 'earned remission' ('good time') off the end of his sentence in order to complete the treatment programme. But, in fact, Hector did give up enough of his earned remission to complete the treatment. By about half way through the treatment, Hector's attitude changed and he expressed what sounded like real remorse for the things he had done. And it

seemed to Felicity that giving up earned remission confirmed the seriousness with which he finally viewed his offenses.

Eleven years have elapsed since Hector was released from this sentence. He enrolled in school, took courses, and became involved in a variety of interesting or frankly weird projects in the ensuing years. With each new project, Hector sent Felicity some memento of what he was doing -- a copy of his certificate or a photograph -- or he wrote or phoned to tell Felicity what he was up to. Also, by chance, Felicity had several face-to-face encounters with Hector on the street. Hector used these opportunities to talk about what he had been doing. Felicity used them as follow-up contacts. And Felicity's repeated 'pulls' of Hector's correctional file has continued to show a clean record, right up to date.

### **A Wired Pyro**

Hugh was an arsonist. He had set fires all over the city in which he lived. In setting each fire, he felt 'in control' of the social world which he felt ostracized him, and he obtained a kind of exhilarating excitement in the sense of 'getting back' he felt over the things he burned. However, he did not experience any sexual excitement, nor was he excited by the ensuing activity when the fire trucks and fire fighters arrived -- such as that noted in the reports of (rare) pyro-erotic cases. In fact, he rarely waited around to see that part of the sequence of events.

Hugh's psychological test performances were quite different from Harry's and Hector's. The DDT scores were within 'normal' limits. But the tests did reveal a high level of anxious tension

which, in his case, seemed to be projected and experienced mainly internally in his viscera ('guts'). It was as though internal tension accumulated within him in a manner which seemed similar to that of most pyro-maniacs. When tension reached an intolerable peak intensity he seemed to feel the need to create a colourful and intense experience (a fire) to relieve the tension.

Because Felicity concluded that the anxious tension targeted the internal parts (viscera), he thought it might be appropriate to use a desensitization method targeting the bodily autonomic response most directly. So, viewing Hugh's behaviour as though it was a compulsive act similar to George's, Felicity started Hugh on Quirk's method of stimulus conditioned autonomic response suppression (SCARS).

There were thirty-five half-hour treatment sessions using the SCARS procedure. By half-way through this treatment, Hugh seemed calmed down and he reported that the fire-setting behaviour had stopped. His calmness and comfort grew through the rest of the treatment. He claims to have set no more fires in the intervening twenty years, and he has not been arrested or charged in that time.

But how could Felicity possibly think of Hector's and Hugh's criminal actions as 'sadistic'? Surely sadism is evidenced only in relation to living things, if not only toward people. Maybe so, and maybe not. Certainly, the way in which Harry, Hector and Hugh described their actions and the ways they were feeling while performing their offenses had all the qualities which characterize most descriptions of 'sadistic' acts. They experienced intense excitement, the sense of exercising power, control and revenge over

other things, and apparent pleasure in inflicting damage and harm. It's true that their acts were not directed at people, and that they involved no sexual excitement. The reasons why sadism has become associated with sexuality in the minds of most people probably lie in three directions.

First, there may be a secondary arousal of sex drive when sadism is activated. The accompanying tense excitement may be interpreted as sexual arousal by the person, and that may serve to lead some people to focus their sadism in sex-related activities. The resulting acts could well create the idea in the minds of the perpetrator, the victim, and the police of an association between sex and sadism, even if the sexual arousal was only secondary.

Second, the media love to find and exploit the sensational to their own commercial advantage. And what could be more sensational than acts involving both sex and violence. The media have taught us to become excited by these their two exploited favourites. And the media have been aided in their training of us because part of the process of anybody's sexual excitement involves arousal of the sympathetic-stress-fear branch of the Autonomic Nervous System. That is, fear, aroused in us by media accounts, may feel equivalent to sexual excitement, so that we may even feel 'excited' by media stories of sexual and violent acts. Our minds have been drawn by the public media, including literature, to associate violence and sex with sadism, as if that is the commonly occurring connection.

Third, the first voice to try to make sense out of sadism was that of Freud ... er ... Freud. Now Freud was a dirty old man who thought that everything about people was motivated by one thing --

sex. He even thought that defecating was a sexual act, referring to it at times as anal erotic. My goodness, he must have had a restricted sex life! On a topic more relevant to this section, he spoke of the infant, who has not yet achieved bowel control, and thus lays waste in its environment, as 'anal sadistic'. What rot! Hopefully, we have learned a great deal more about people since Freud was spinning his fancies about humankind -- which was years before we had a productive science of psychology. Certainly, we know of at least two human inhabitants of this planet who are not exclusively motivated by sex -- you and me. And if there are two, there may just be three.

## **Chapter 6**

### **Criminality -- Guilt Intolerance**

Felicity would almost prefer to leave this chapter heading all by itself without further comment. It may be one of the simplest capsule phrases there is to capture a whole area of human enterprise. That's right, most crime is motivated mainly by guilt. The trouble is that the person who is going to be a criminal feels

so uncomfortable about guilt feelings that he will not tolerate them or the 'guilt trips' which he thinks others lay on him. Feeling guilt or being put on a guilt trip leads him to feel angry. And he may even act in such a way that others might think he 'ought' to feel guilty -- partly to prove to himself that he has made himself impervious to feeling guilt. That's what is meant by 'guilt intolerance'.

It's true that there are other motives underlying criminality. These include: inferiority or failure intolerance, disturbance or distress intolerance, sensitivity or empathy intolerance, closeness or interaction intolerance, conformity or introspection intolerance, regulation or discipline intolerance, and intolerance for internal or external controls. Subcultural values and self-enhancement needs may also underlie some crime. But if there is one basic theme subsumed in all the factors underlying crime it may be intolerance for internal or external controls, which is probably best represented by guilt intolerance.

Since Felicity has only recently started to come to grips with some of these ideas in his treatment work, he is not yet ready to tell stories to illustrate what he has not yet learned about the real factors underlying criminality in general. Some of his cases involved in particular forms of criminality have been described in the foregoing. However, in addressing criminality in general, it seems most appropriate to refer to the work of a researcher named Reynolds. Reynolds has taken the science fiction of Yokelson and Samenow's writings on the criminal personality to heights of clarity and empirical understanding not even guessed to be possible

by the original writers in this field.

Felicity is ready only to remark that the intolerance of guilt manufactures a quiet raging anger, sometimes called rebelliousness. The function of rebelliousness seems to be to deny and damn all self-depreciating guilt feelings and to generate a new more active feeling by converting the emotion felt in guilt into a destructive force against all that might induce guilt in the person. Society has tried to re-convert the anger back into the guilt from which it came. This has been attempted by demeaning criminals as people unable to feel guilt, and it has relegated them to penitentiaries where they may languish until once more they can feel (but do not) the penitence of guilt -- which society (wrongly) believes impedes criminal conduct.

Having just made all this up, and not yet having had time to dream up any cases or treatment based on this clearly brilliant, correct and modern view of what crime is about, Felicity prefers not to spin any yarns about cases involved in this kind of anger -- the anger bred of an intolerance of guilt. Now that's integrity!