

Plight of a Parent – Web or Internet, Item #1

“More than the treatment (or mistreatment) of the technology is the reaction of my children...”
- Kirk Rainer, a father of four alienated children

In October, following my release from jail, I received the contents of the evidence pertaining to my case; a summary of the evidence was provided in the previous writing, “Plight of a Parent – Aggravated Stalking”. This next in a series is specifically about “Item #1” of the evidence described as follows:

1. Myspace.com account in which I post my writings (note, the site cannot be removed at this time, but has been made private since October 1st 2008 such that my children cannot learn of their father...the Website was set-up in 2005 – before the injunction was initiated

The summary (from “Plight...Aggravated Staking”) began as follows:

... The account was actually set-up by someone else – who was more proficient at that sort of thing. Generally, I don’t think much of Myspace.com – its general content; yet, there is nothing on my account that could have been perceived or even exaggerated as malicious, violent, sexual or fitting the description of simple assault. Only in the context of an injunction would such material or content be stigmatized as simple assault.

While an estranged or alienated parent is understandingly a grievous matter, the blow(s) have been softened by the advent and accessibility to the Web – to sites that offer some evidence that my children are still alive. The downside is that these small evidences of my children are just that...small; while for the courts, this technology is yet another mode of “maliciousness” – where good intentions of a parent are perverted into something on scale of a predator.

More than the treatment (or mistreatment) of the technology is the reaction of my children based on the evidence (or affidavit) of one of my children. As their paternal grandparents have commented at times on one of the Websites, my child’s reaction (or narrative) is expressed as annoyance, even fear. How can the simple and conventional comments of a grandparent become so complex, even alarming to a teen? Sure, teens have their “own world” and are sometimes humiliated by the presence of their parents in the forum; but that is not what I am trying to describe to you. No, I am suggesting or offering yet another example of how the children – my children – have been duped into believing that their paternal family is dangerous or potentially harmful. Among the sources of this “grievous matter” of an alienated parent is the ever growing understanding that such fear-mongering is a regular or routine part of my children’s lives.

They are programmed to believe such things – though having some (perhaps much) recollection to the contrary. The public defender is right; *the world is messed-up*.

To add to this “grievous matter” is to know that such “programming” – where children are misinformed or deceived into believing false information – is not without the understanding of its effect and consequences. As parents, each of us were instructed on this ill-practice during our post-divorce counseling; subsequently, similar information was provided to us during a meeting with Family Court in Duval County in 2003; and still other sources (mutual friends) have attempted to dissuade the use of such practices – knowing all too well that such purposeful “programming” is to itself a form of abuse.

When children of divorce (or similar circumstances) are consistently exposed to this programming, even the notion of any contradiction (information, action, behavior or sentiment) is a major issue. Such contradictions or counter-notions could play havoc on the matter – casting doubt at the least and potentially leaving the maturing children with a growing sense of distrust. I can imagine that nothing would hurt me more (as a child) than to learn or discover (as an older child and/or adult) that the profile of that distanced parent was wrong; that they were not as I was told; that they did love and even went to jail in attempting to do so. Now that’s a grievous matter!

Programming under such conditions may seem shocking or even unbelievable; and if accepted as potentially true, it would be justified as wrong – even malicious. Accepting that someone would purposely and intentionally lie to their own children is both a hard matter to accept; and as far as reason(s); at best a mystery or peculiarity. After all, this programming is indeed lying and, moreover, lying to your own children. Plain reason and social science point very clearly to the facts that such programming can and does create an eventual chasm or rift between parent and child.

The effect and consequences of programming can sometimes be difficult to ascertain on the basis that dealing with such a painful experience (or behavior) takes a lot of courage...and sacrifice; courage because the once-cherished trust has been dashed – not once, but systemically – and this is very painful; sacrifice because the once-trusted has been discovered and may not be willing to discuss the matter, let alone accept responsibility. Denial, defensiveness or contrition is one of several possibilities; however, admission to wrongdoing is the first step...a very big step!

Ideally, the child (or children) reaches a level of maturity – a healthy disposition – where the potential sacrifice is outweighed by the courage; and should the sacrifice prove too great, he or she can courageously walk-away, forgive in time and be free.