

consciousness by wish or impulse is too strong to be erased from consciousness by repression, and it enters awareness. Then it is both recognized and disowned as part of oneself. "I do not want any of her money." At times the thought is handled by attributing it to other people. "I know you think I'm after the money but I'm not."

The venomous talk Mrs. Judy Melander reported hearing from Mrs. K about her friend Mary Jane shocked her. It was shocking to the sick person's daughter, incomprehensible and very frightening to find relatives who had been distant, indifferent, and certainly not menacing transformed into antagonistic arrogant overbearing defaming unscrupulous predatory foes. To find this centering round the terminal illness of her mother and the intelligent appropriate planning and she undertook for her mother appalled and frightened the young woman.

Foul though all this was it paled insignificance when it became apparent that other persons, several of them, had been or were being involved in her life as well as her mother's declining life in ways she could not possibly have imagined. There were several people with an interest in Mrs. Jane Duchene.

There may have been some meetings and discussions about Mrs. Duchene before Mary Jane arrived from Europe. A Ms. Massman had professional contact with the patient prior to discharge from hospital in 1986. This person, an R.N., was the "continuum of care" person at the hospital. I assume that involves the transition from institution to home. This woman made no effort to establish a working relationship with the patient's daughter and was inexplicably hostile and unhelpful when Mary Jane did en-

counter her. Massman made phone calls to Mrs. Duchene at home. She avoided talking to the responsible adult relative, Miss Duchene, curtly asking for Jane Duchene. This conduct seemed disquieting, rather bizarre and unprofessional to Mary Jane. As I hear it, it was.

Things had been set in motion, unknown to Miss Duchene, some originating from known sources of malevolence and hatred previously encountered in Jane Duchene's life and to a much lesser intent in Mary Jane's life at home. Speculation as to the persons involved and the genesis of crisis erupting in the lives of these two women can be put aside at present; one mentally ill, well into a devastating incapacitating dementia, the other highly intelligent, civilized and engaged in the painful experience of seeing her mother cease to be the woman she had known and the woman who had known her. Watching her mother go down hill in all spheres, needing to do all the things necessary for mundane daily life, learning, planning and preparing for imminent changes, Mary Jane appears to have been doing these things well.

Unresponsiveness, insensitivity and incomprehension were more apparent in Jane, who was increasingly withdrawn and helpless, unhappy to be so reduced and in need of help, yet resenting Mary Jane's efforts on her behalf and at times denying her manifest lacks.

It is well to remember, at the point just prior to March 20, 1986, that Mrs. Jane Duchene had been experiencing or manifesting things not previously part of her life. From the summer of 1985 on, Mary Jane found her to be changed in some elusive way

and this distressed her a lot. She discussed her distress with Gil Jackson, Ph.D. and his wife. Several others noted Jane was somehow different. In the fall of 1985 driving as she did with Georgia Ek, an old friend, she unaccountably struck a motor cyclist from behind, despite repeated cautions from Georgia. Oddly she sat like a mummy, after the impact, showing no concern for the man on the motor cycle or her passenger. She lost sense of taste and smell and was very upset, believing this heralded her death. Soon she began to exhibit perseveration regarding this loss of sensory loss. Her memory was failing and she couldn't remember things she'd just done or read. Grasp was impaired and she felt confused. She began to lose the familiarity she felt in old neighborhoods forgetting them as they had been. She seemed out of touch at times in the hospital in January 1986. A visitor commented on her blank staring, unresponsiveness to questions, contradictions in thought. At times she'd say she had cancer and it was terminal. Other times she would deny knowing what her condition was. There were other changes noted but they will be taken up in the history of the illness later.

THE EVENING OF MARCH 20, 1986 IS ONE OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE.
THESE HAPPENED:

Mrs. Duchene was taken by her brother on the pretext of a dinner invitation, to the office of Dakota County Social Services, 33 East Wentworth Avenue, West St. Paul, Minnesota 55118. Mary Jane had been reported by a person or persons unknown to be abusing her dying mother, a Vulnerable Adult. The two Krauses were there, enthusiastic proponents of the abuse theory. They

had prior contact it would seem with Mr. Reichstadt.

Jane Duchene had come willingly or at least without significant resistance to the social worker's office and was agreeable to an interview with Detective Jeff Batzel, West St. Paul Police Department.

Like Ken Reichstadt in his department, Batzel was responsible for investigating reports of abuse of Vulnerable Adults. Jane was there ostensibly to be interviewed to establish what grounds existed for taking the anonymous reports seriously, what evidence was there to support a finding of abuse, and what was the status of the vulnerable adult physically and mentally. If there were hints of psychological problems or symptoms, consultation with a Board Certified Psychiatrist would be indicated. If a psychiatric disorder were considered and it definitely should have been, two issues arise in the reliability of the vulnerable adult complaints. 1) Could they be a product of a psychiatric disorder? This patient was openly delusional about her daughter and other issues. 2) Is the vulnerable adult competent to engage in other legal proceedings?

I would be quite tentative in my opinions at the beginning and quite possibly at the end of a diagnostic interview, especially one involving another person whom I had not had an opportunity to interview. I should expect considerations of accuracy and reliability would require that I examine other persons or people. I would expect that fairness and decent practice considerations would demand I give the anonymously accused a full opportunity to confront the accusations.

I would want the abused adult to tell me whatever she wanted

to, asking questions if necessary to point out significant omissions. I would assess as best I could the reliability of the information given by whatever informants informing unknown to the accused had said. I most certainly would not act on or make major decisions affecting lives irreversibly on anonymous hearsay and a 22 minute interview in a group of five people. I wouldn't want to delude myself that I was making sound decisions based on valid data from the subject if I pushed that person to answer my series of preconceived questions, focused largely on one subject. I would know I was fooling myself if I didn't listen to the other person.

Detective Batzel takes charge of his interview. He has questions to ask and he asks them deviating little from them. When the client talks spontaneously about other matters of interest to the client Detective Batzel says O.K. and brings the subject back to the right subject. The interesting subject in this investigative interview is money. Detective Batzel asks most questions about the money or where it is. Detective Batzel is not a man for spontaneity in response to his questions. He often gives the right answer along with the question. The answer he gives most is that Mary Jane is draining off all the money and taking it to England for herself, leaving her mother in poverty and with nowhere to live.

Mrs. Duchene has delusions of peverty already. She has delusions she has no place to go. She is paranoid, to a delusional extent, about her daughter. She is ready prey to the suggestions that Mary Jane is busy stealing her own money--it is

in joint accounts.

It does not seem to interest the Detective or the other participants that Mrs. Duchene when asked to give her name says "Krause" and is unaware of her mistake until it is pointed out. It doesn't seem to trouble her when, at the outset, Batzel defines the rationale of the investigative interview as follows:

Det. B: "And the reason you are here this evening is because you were contacted by Ken Reichstadt and you were asked to come down here tonight, ah, at least your brother was to bring you down here tonight."

Mrs. D: "Yeah"

Det. B: "Because there is some belief that maybe your daughter Mary Jane Duchene who is presently staying with you and prior to that apparently resides in England, might be taking some money out of your accounts. Is that right?"

Mrs. D: "Yes, they're joint accounts."

The fact that this woman does not react to the suggestion she's been brought to Batzel's office to talk about the odd notion that her daughter might be stealing money that is hers currently and that will be hers still when her mother dies, suggests a dullness, a loss of previous sensibilities or persecutory delusions. Batzel pursues questions about accounts and time. Mrs. Duchene is vague and imprecise, she can't remember.

Det. B: "How long has your daughter been living with you?"

Mrs. D: "Now?"

Det. B: "Um huh"

Mrs. D: "Well she just came because I was sick."

Det. B: "Okay, that was about the ninth of Feb. when she came back, of this year."

Mrs. D: "Was that when it was, I've kinda lost track of that time." (DEFINITE MEMORY IMPAIRMENT - THIS IS A SIGNIFICANT FACT! THE PATIENT IS SAYING SHE HAS A DEFINITE MEMORY LOSS AND PARTICULARLY LOSS FOR RECENT EVENTS IS A MAJOR SIGN OF "TRANSIENT OR PERMANENT DYS-FUNCTION OF THE BRAIN" -- DSM PAGE 98)

Det. B: "Okay, cus you have been ill is that right? (HE IS NOT INTERESTED IN HER HAVING MEMORY LOSS)

Mrs. D: "Yes"

Det. B: "All right, do you have cancer? (DETECTIVE BATZEL HAS ALL THE HUMAN WARMTH OF A CASH REGISTER)

Mrs. D: "Yes"

Det. B: "And are you taking treatments for that?"

Mrs. D: "Chemo"

The rest of the questions relate to the accusations, e.g. she is kept prisoner in the home. Mary Jane will not allow visitors or anyone to take Mrs. Duchene out. (THAT ACCUSATION SOUNDS A BIT HOLLOW AT THE MOMENT.)

Det. B: "Has she been allowing you to go out and do things you want to do?"

Mrs. D: "Well she, I don't know, she possibly would yes."

Det. B: "Have you asked her?"

Mrs. D: "Well like I was going to go out Monday with Ruth and Lorraine for lunch and that and she said okay so long as it is nobody in the family. She's a little afraid of you." (looking at her brother.)

Det. B: "Your're looking at your brother, right? OK?"

Mrs. D: "That's because he's a, he's a I suppose in her mind she knows that he could probably try to get power of attorney."

Det. B: "Okay."

Mrs. D: "And but yet she don't dare talk to me about it either you know."

Det. B: "Okay." (Batzel CUTS HER OFF WITH TWO OKAYS and goes on to question her about the specific bank accounts and to elicit the fact that her daughter had made a substantial withdrawal from this account.)

There are more questions aimed at clarifying Mrs. Duchene's lack of knowledge of this particular transaction. The sequence following is illustrative of important processes.

Det. B: "Did you know that until you got the statement?"

Mrs. D: "No but I did know she was after money there because she wanted to invest money some other way to make more money with it I did not know that there was nothing I could do about it I nobody, was nobody else to ytake care of me and I was just about went along with her on anything she said."

Det. B: "Okay. So she told you she was going to take some money out of your accounts to reinvest and make more money."

Mrs. D: "No not that one she didn't but I know she's talking about it for the Midwest and"

Det. B: "Okay. But what she told you is that she was going to take some of your money to reinvest it and make more

money for you."

Mrs. D: "I ah yeah."

Det. B: "That's what she told you. You believed that?"

Mrs. D: "Not deep down, no."

Det. B: "Okay, what your're telling me is that you think she's taking your money and she's going to use it herself. Is that what you are telling me?"

Mrs. D: "Or at least til after I'm gone you know."

Det. B: "Okay. Do you have any other accounts....."

Mary Jane Duchene has legal duties as guardian including payments for her mother's care as long as Jane Duchene survived. Jane cannot handle her affairs financially and otherwise. It seems appropriate for her daughter to be dealing with their jointly held money as she saw fit. It could not have been an easy responsibility or burden to assume. The unwarranted hostility of the Krauses and the "continuum of care" person, Nancy Massman, compounded the difficulties for Mary Jane and for her mother. It was scarcely "care" to reinforce paranoid trends common in organic syndrome patients. In so doing, these people sabotaged Ms. Duchene's efforts. Mrs. Duchene was impaired. She could not keep track of and pay even household bills much less more complex matters. She did not acknowledge many disabilities and the necessity of Mary Jane doing work by default. Instead she confabulated, complaining to thers that Mary Jane would not let her do things, i.e. controlled her. (CONFABULATION HERE IS THE AUTOMATIC FABRICATION OR FILLING IN OF MEMORY DEFECTS FOUND IN ORGANIC BRAIN CONDITIONS, NOT CONSCIOUS LYING.) Mary Jane was

under the pressure of events and unpredictable timing. The prognosis given regarding her mother's remaining life varied from a few days or months, initially, to three years a little later on. There were a number of possible complications which would necessitate changing arrangements. The financial aspects and structures were only part of the numerous problems and demands Mary Jane faced. It didn't seem to occur to people that Mary Jane's professional, business, financial and personal interests in Europe had to be put aside at great continuing cost to her. That a mentally deteriorating patient's persecutory delusions turned against the one person devoting herself to the patient's care, could be taken at face value by professionals and grow into a sort of lynch-mob hatred - and that is not hyperbole, Ms. Duchene has been and is being treated hatefully by people who don't know her - is a sobering example of dangerous group psychopathology.

In the sequence of the interview above several significant elements seem clear. Mrs. Duchene's helplessness, near total ineffectuality and dependency are manifest. She does not know what monies they have or where they have them nor what is being done with them. She had asked and expected her daughter to take care of such things. Mary Jane's leaving her own business and other concerns in Europe was to take care of her mother in all major respects. That she was doing, and should have been doing.

The lack of knowledge of her financial affairs manifested by Jane Duchene is not due to withholding of information by anyone. She had access to the banks, the telephone and her daughter. Her vagueness, uncertainty, helplessness, memory loss, inability to