



**TURNINGPOINTS FOR FAMILIES  
(TPFF)**

**A THERAPEUTIC VACATION  
WITH  
LINDA J. GOTTLIEB, LMFT, LCSW-R**

**ADAPTING STRUCTURAL  
FAMILY THERAPY  
(SFT)**

**FOUNDED BY SALVADOR  
MINUCHIN, MD**

**TO THE TREATMENT AT TPFF**

# **AXIOMS OF MOST MODELS OF FAMILY SYSTEMS THERAPY:**

- 1. EXPERIENCE, NOT INSIGHT, PRODUCES CHANGE**
- 2. THE SITE OF PATHOLOGY IS WITHIN DYSFUNCTIONAL FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS NOT WITHIN THE INDIVIDUAL.**

## **MINUCHIN'S COMPLEMENTARITY:**

**PEOPLE IN INTIMATE RELATIONSHIPS  
WITH EACH OTHER HAVE THE POWER  
TO CHANGE EACH OTHER**

**(JUDITH'S POWER OF FAMILIARITY, WHICH  
IS INCREASED EXPONENTIALLY BECAUSE  
OF THE EMOTIONALITY IN FAMILY  
CONNECTIONS.**

# **COMPLIMENTARITY IMPLIES:**

**WE ARE MOST LIKELY TO CHANGE  
FOR THOSE WHOM WE LOVE AND FOR  
THOSE WHO LOVE US**

**(HOWIE'S HUG)**

**AT TPDF: THE ALIENATED PARENT IS  
ELEVATED INTO THE POSITION OF  
THE HEALER OF THE CHILD**

**ACCORDING TO FAMILY  
SYSTEMS THEORY:**

**IT TAKES TWO TO TANGO;**

**RELATIONSHIPS ARE 50/50.**

**EXCEPT WHEN YOUR PARTNER IS A**



***PERSONALITY DISORDER***

**WHEN SOMEONE'S BEHAVIORS ARE EXTREME  
EXTREMISM THAT VERONICA DESCRIBED AND  
INVOLVE THE ALIENATING STRATEGIES SHE  
RECOUNTED:**

**IT'S **NOT** A 50/50 SITUATION.**

**BOTH PARENTS DID **NOT** CONTRIBUTE.**

**THE TRUTH DOES **NOT** LIE SOMEWHERE IN  
THE MIDDLE**

**IT'S **NOT** A HYBRID CASE.**



**REUNIFICATION MODELS THAT INCLUDE THE AP AND THAT ALSO FAIL TO PROHIBIT ALL CONTACT BETWEEN THE SEVERE AP AND CHILD WILL FAIL BECAUSE:**

**THE CHILD WILL NOT BE FREED FROM THE LOYALTY CONFLICT DESCRIBED BY OLGA.**

**A THERAPIST CANNOT HAVE A THERAPEUTIC ALLIANCE WITH BOTH THE AP AND THE ALIENATED PARENT WITHOUT FURTHER DAMAGING THE ALIENATED PARENT'S EGO FUNCTIONING, THAT HAS BEEN ALREADY DAMAGED FROM THE ALIENATION AS REVEALED IN LENA'S INTERVIEWS. (IT IS LIKELY A CONFLICT OF INTEREST TO HAVE A THERAPEUTIC ROLE WITH BOTH PARENTS.)**

**WHEN IS TPDF THE  
TREATMENT OF CHOICE?**

**WHEN CHILDREN HAVE PASSED  
NICK'S TIPPING POINT**

## **REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION TO TPDF**

**BY COURT ORDER WHICH MUST  
STIPULATE:**

**SOLE LEGAL AND PHYSICAL CUSTODY TO  
ALIENATED PARENT**

**A NO-CONTACT PERIOD BETWEEN CHILD  
AND AP PREFERABLY FOR INDEFINITE TIME  
BUT A MINIMUM 90-DAYS (CONTACT TO BE  
RE-EVALUATED AT END OF NO-CONTACT  
PERIOD)**

**AP MUST WRITE LETTER TO CHILD  
(NICK'S ACTION TEST FOR THE  
ALIENATING PARENT) TO STATE:**

**SUPPORT THE REUNIFICATION AND  
WHY**

**DESCRIBES QUALITIES OF ALIENATED  
PARENT**

**AFFIRMS WHY IT IS  
IMPORTANT/IMPERATIVE TO CHILD TO  
HAVE ALIENATED PARENT  
MEANINGFULLY IN LIFE**

**I WAS ABLE TO APPROVE ONLY 1  
OUT OF 9 AP LETTERS—WITH AS  
MANY 6 REVISIONS IN SOME  
CASES.**

**THE 2 MOST COMMON REASONS  
FOR REJECTING THE LETTER:**

**FAILURE TO CONVEY *GENUINE*  
SUPPORT FOR THE REUNIFICATION**

**CONTAINED *UNSOLICITED*  
INFORMATION**

**STRONGLY SUGGESTED IN COURT  
ORDER:**

**AP MUST BE EVALUATED FOR PD AND  
WILLINGNESS TO SUPPORT THE  
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE  
ALIENATED PARENT AND THEIR CHILD  
AND ACCEPT RECOMMENDED  
TREATMENT**

**DAY 1: USE OF MEMORABILIA TO  
WALK CHILD AND ALIENATED  
PARENT DOWN MEMORY  
LANE WITH DISCUSSION OF  
THE EVENTS DEPICTED; LUNCH;  
AFTERNOON ACTIVITY. (ASK  
LYNN FOR FEEDBACK ABOUT THE  
EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS  
INTERVENTION)**



**DAY 2: PLAYING VIDEO:**

***WELCOME BACK PLUTO;***

**DISCUSSION ABOUT**

**RELEVANCY OF VIDEO TO**

**THE FAMILY'S DYNAMICS;**

**CORRECTION OF CHILD'S**

**REVISIONIST FAMILY**

**HISTORY; LUNCH;**

**AFTERNOON ACTIVITY.**

**DAY 3: VIDEOS (LOFTUS, BRUCK, ETC.,) ON THE CORRUPTION OF HUMAN MEMORY; EASE OF IMPLANTING FALSE MEMORIES; DISCUSSION; ABSOLVING CHILD OF GUILT FOR MALTREATMENT OF ALIENATED PARENT BUT EXPECTATION TO SHOW RESPECT AND COOPERATION GOING FORWARD; LUNCH; AFTERNOON ACTIVITY.**

**DAY 4: GOING FORWARD WITH LIFE IN  
CUSTODY AND CARE OF  
ALIENATED PARENT;  
DEPENDING ON CHILD'S AGE, A  
DISCUSSION OF WHEN NO-  
CONTACT PERIOD WILL BE LIFTED;  
NEGOTIATION OF RULES CHILD  
WILL LIVE BY COMMENSURATE  
WITH CHILD'S AGE; LUNCH;  
AFTERNOON ACTIVITY;  
EMOTIONAL GOODBYES.**

**OUTCOMES**

## **DEFINITION OF SUCCESSFUL REUNIFICATION:**

CHILDREN COMMUNICATED RESPECTFULLY  
WITH PARENT AND WITH PARTICIPATING  
FAMILY MEMBERS

ABUSIVE, DEFIANT MALTREATMENT OF  
ALIENATED ELIMINATED

CHILDREN ACCEPTED PARENT'S SUPERVISION

CHILDREN WERE HELPED TO GROW DOWN:  
DISEMPOWERED

HEALTHY FAMILY HIERARCHY ESTABLISHED

## **DEFINITION OF SUCCESSFUL REUNIFICATION:**

CHILDREN HAD MOMENTS OF GENUINE,  
SPONTANEOUS EXPRESSION OF AFFECTION,  
HUMOR, AND/OR CONVIVIALITY WITH PARENT

CHILDREN SHARED INTIMATE INFORMATION  
ABOUT THEMSELVES

ALL PARTICIPATED IN DISCUSSION ABOUT  
THEIR LIFE IN THE CARE OF THE ALIENATED  
PARENT AFTER LEAVING TPFF

ALIENATED PARENT IS SATISFIED WITH THE  
OUTCOME

# TRAVEL TO TPDF

**With alienating  
parent: 6**

**By plane: 1**

**By car: 5**

**With alienated  
parent: 23**

**By plane: 8**

**By car: 15**

# LENGTH OF TIME OF SEVERED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ALIENATED PARENT AND CHILD

**# of years: 1**

**# of years: 2-3**

**# of years: 4**

**# of Children: 2**

**# of Children: 19**

**# of Children: 8**



# CHILDREN, BY AGE, WHO RECONNECTED TO THEIR ALIENATED PARENT DURING THE 4-DAY INTERVENTION AT TPF: 29 OF 29

# of children age 5 2	# of children age 8 1	# of children age 9 4	# of children age 10 3	# of children age 11 2
# of children age 12 2	# of children age 13 4	# of children age 15 3	# of children age 16 4	# of children age 17 4

# TIME SINCE DEPARTURE FROM TPF

up to 1 year:	# of years: 1	# of years: 2	# of years: 3	# of years: 4	# of years: 5
# of children: 7	# of children: 8	# of children: 3	# of children: 3	# of children: 6	# of children: 2

# CHILDREN BY AGE WHO REMAIN IN SOLE CUSTODY OF THEIR “FORMERLY” ALIENATED PARENT: 19 OF 29

<b>Age of child: 7-9</b> <b># of children: 2</b>	<b>Age of child: 10</b> <b># of children: 2</b>	<b>Age of child: 12</b> <b># of children: 1</b>	<b>Age of child: 14</b> <b># of children: 3</b>	<b>Age of child: 15</b> <b># of children: 3</b>
<b>Age of child: 16</b> <b># of children: 1</b>	<b>Age of child: 17</b> <b># of children: 2</b>	<b>Age of child: 18</b> <b># of children: 1</b>	<b>Age of child: 20</b> <b># of children: 2</b>	<b>Age of child: 21</b> <b># of children: 2</b>

**CHILDREN, BY AGE, WHO ARE MAINTAINING A MEANINGFUL  
RELATIONSHIP WITH BOTH PARENTS  
(50/50 PHYSICAL CUSTODY)**

**Age 17**

**# of children: 1**

# CHILDREN BY AGE WHO RETURNED TO CUSTODY OF AP BUT HAVE SOME (NOT SATISFACTORY) RELATIONSHIP WITH ALIENATED PARENT

Age of child: 7	Age of child: 12	Age of child: 13	Age of child: 15	Age of child: 16
# of children: 1	# of children: 1	# of children: 1	# of children: 1	# of children: 2

RESIDENTIAL CUSTODY OF 3 OF THE CHILDREN WAS ORDERED OVER THE  
OBJECTIONS OF TPF.

3 SIBLINGS WERE RETURNED BY THE ALIENATED PARENT AFTER ALMOST 2  
YEARS OF CUSTODY BECAUSE THE CHILDREN WERE UNMANAGEABLE: THEY  
COULD NOT BE DISABUSED OF THE FALSE BELIEF THAT THEIR ALIENATED  
PARENT **HAD A PLAN TO MURDER THEM.**

**CHILDREN, WHO RELAPSED, AT AGE OF RELAPSE, AND WHO ARE AGAIN SEVERELY ALIENATED: 3 OF 27**

**Age of child: 10**

**# of children: 1**

**Age of child: 16**

**# of children: 1**

**Age of child: 18**

**# of children: 1**

# ALIENATING PARENTS WHO HAVE NOT COMPLIED WITH THE STIPULATIONS OF THE COURT ORDER, BY LENGTH OF TIME

<b>Up to 1 year:</b>	<b>For 1 year:</b>	<b>For 2 years or more:</b>	<b>For 4 years or more:</b>	<b>For 5 years or more:</b>
<b># of parents: 2</b>	<b># of parents: 4</b>	<b># of parents: 2</b>	<b># of parents: 2</b>	<b># of parents: 1</b>

# CASES (# 12) THAT HAD AN UNFOUNDED ALLEGATION OF CHILD ABUSE AND/OR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

HOW **SPECIFIC** OF AN ALIENATOR WOULD BE: TO KNOWINGLY & DELIBERATELY MAKE A FALSE ABUSE ALLEGATION?

WHAT PROBABILITY CALL WOULD YOU MAKE FOR AN ALIENATOR IF THE PERSON MAKES MULTIPLE SUCH FALSE ALLEGATIONS?

at least  
one time: 12

Multiple  
times: 9

6, 6+, 19  
times: 5?

DOES ANYONE BELIEVE THAT A NON-ALIENATOR WOULD KNOWINGLY AND DELIBERATELY MAKE EVEN ONE FALSE ABUSE ALLEGATIONS?