



## MEMBER CENTER

» [Family Court Review](#)

» [AFCC Conference Audio](#)

» [AFCC News](#)

» [Member Directory](#)

» [Member Resources](#)

» [Chapter Resources](#)

» [AFCC HOME](#)



### Security by association? Mapping attachment theory onto family law practice

*Benjamin D. Garber, PhD, Merrimack, New Hampshire*

*The friend of my friend is my friend.  
The enemy of my friend is my enemy.*

-Ancient aphorism

This journal's recent success bringing together a number of the world's preeminent attachment theorists, researchers and clinicians to address many of today's critical dilemmas in family law (*Family Court Review*, 49 [3], July 2011) prompts a paraphrase of astronaut Neil Armstrong's proud declaration: 'One small step for guest editor Jennifer McIntosh, one giant leap on behalf of the children involved in family law matters.'

Indeed, articles coauthored by McIntosh, Sroufe, Waters, Schore, Marvin, Seigel and others are remarkable not only for their insight, empirical integrity, and clarity of presentation, but arguably more so for the consistency of their messages. Chief among these messages is the proposal that infants benefit from a single, primary secure base at least until they have the cognitive wherewithal to understand the migratory patterns our courts are inclined to impose upon them (Main et al., 2011). Not only does primary placement in Parent A's care through years one, two and three allow the dyad to develop a secure relationship, it opens the door for the child to thereafter develop secure bonds with others, including and especially Parent B. To divide the infant's time otherwise, these authors argue, is to make the child work too hard and to potentially undermine her capacity to feel secure in any relationship.

Certainly no parent wants to be marginalized in the Parent B role, visiting his or her baby for brief daylight hours several times each week. However, the hypothetical parent who accepts the theory and manages to put aside his or her needs in the best interest of the child for as long as three years (or, more likely, the court-ordered parent who has no other choice, pending appeal), reasonably asks how the child's socio-emotional gains in Parent A's care will someday magically generalize to include him or her. Unfortunately, the attachment experts and the science that they so eloquently summarize fail to answer this question directly. Instead, one is left to infer a dynamic that might be conceptualized as *security by association*.

### Primary versus secondary attachment?

The authors argue a la Bowlby (1988) that, in the harsh light of evolutionary biology, the infant's opportunity to establish a primary attachment is imperative. They reason that the infant with a single, unambiguous safe haven has a survival advantage over her peer with two (or more) attachment figures who, figuratively consumed with the geometry of which of her havens is safest, risks being literally consumed by a predator in the process (Sroufe and McIntosh, 2011).

(This reasoning also allows one to imagine evolution's first custody battle emerging as the latter child's primary attachment figures argue over who can provide the best protection. The child thus triangulated is at an additional evolutionary disadvantage in that she becomes even more

vulnerable to predation while her caregivers are preoccupied filing motions and appearing in court.)

To those of us who fear that infancy constitutes a critical (or at least a sensitive) period for the development of attachments thereby locking out the poor, marginalized Parent B forevermore, the July *FCR* authors reply like a Greek chorus, 'bah, humbug!' Healthy human beings form attachment relationships throughout the lifespan, from grandparents to daycare providers and, as adults, to intimate partners. The question is, how?

#### **(In-)security by association**

Outside the extremes of deprivation, the quality of a child's primary attachment relationship has no necessary bearing on the quality of her subsequent attachment relationships. We know, for example, that the quality of a child's attachment to each of her two parents can be quite distinct and is strongly related to the child's experience of each parent's sensitive and responsive care (Main et al., 2011). Thus, when Parent B begins to assume greater and greater caregiving responsibility sometime in the child's third year, he is neither gifted nor cursed by the child's prior experience of Parent A's caregiving successes and failures.

But is Parent B on his own to establish a secure relationship with the child whom he has only known in passing throughout the course of her first three years? These authors suggest that the answer is no. The quality of a child's attachment with Parent B is strongly mediated via the child's experience of Parent A's relationship with and reaction to Parent B. This dynamic is implicit in George et al.'s (2011, p. 523) reference to the critical value of the primary parent's endorsement of the potential new attachment figure, as when the child experiences his parents', "...shared joy in the baby and eagerness to be together...."

Lieberman et al., (2011, p. 536) explicitly state that, "... to facilitate the development of an attachment to the father, the mother would be present with the father and the young child. Her presence would take separation reactions off the table for the child, and then at least they would be comfortable in exploring and developing a relationship with the father."

Richard Bowlby (2011, p. 555) recommends that, "Optimally, when you are building an attachment relationship, the primary figure is there, supporting it on a frequent basis, and physically present to start with. You have then got to start stressing the child a little, to realize that at some level their attachment seeking can be terminated by the new friend."

But what of the child who never receives Parent A's endorsement of Parent B?

What happens when the toddler, held tight in Parent A's arms, feels that caregiver's pulse quicken, her muscles contract, her breathing become rapid and shallow, her voice become loud and harsh in response to Parent B's approach? Far from inducing comfort, inviting exploration, and communicating security, these responses alert the child that a threat is approaching. They trigger proximity seeking. Being removed from the safe haven that Parent A provides is the last thing that this child needs—an outcome evolution has programmed her to avoid at all cost—and yet this is precisely the outcome that we have engineered.

Of course, Parent A is likely unaware of the extent to which she is communicating her anxiety about her former partner (no matter the objective validity of that reaction) to her child. From her point of view, the child's clingy, distressed behavior in Parent B's presence is certain confirmation of her worst fears. She believes that even the baby recognizes that her other parent is a (insert expletive) harsh, demanding, insensitive, even abusive and neglectful parent. In this way, the primary attachment figure and the child feed off of one another in a destructive and self-reinforcing spiral of anxiety-fear-greater anxiety such that the child's opportunity to establish a secure relationship with Parent B is over before it's begun. Thus alienation is born in its most primitive, preverbal form (Garber, 2004).

#### **Forensic applications**

Dr. McIntosh and colleagues have provided the family law community with an invaluable and long overdue perspective on the processes underlying the typical child's experience of security and the role of this experience in shaping her continuing development. I fear, however, that we may do the children whom we serve a disservice by mapping population-based,

empirically-derived norms onto the very non-normative, unique subgroup who fill our offices and our courtrooms (Garber, 2009).

These parents represent a very small but very loud and demanding fraction among all divorcing parents. They are intractably conflicted; recidivist litigants who commonly behave as if their children are possessions to be divided like bank accounts, even if they know enough to say otherwise. Among these parents, custody is a matter of winning and non-custody is experienced as an intolerable narcissistic injury that must be righted, no matter the cost. I suspect that these adults are disproportionately unresolved/disorganized in their own attachment security (Main et al., 2011) and thereby especially vulnerable to role corruption in relationship with their children (Garber, 2011). The likelihood that any such parent would genuinely endorse her former partner to and around their child in the interest of fostering the child's healthy (albeit secondary) attachment with that parent is remote.

Thus, I write to pose a critical dilemma: If we can reasonably anticipate that Parent A will never endorse Parent B as a potential secure attachment figure, does it still serve the child's best interests to spend her formative years in a near exclusive relationship with that parent? How do the intangible scales of emotion, development, and relatedness weigh the greater stress that the young child who transitions between two primary caregivers must endure against the possibility that the child enjoys an exclusive primary attachment through infancy but might never thereafter enjoy the benefits of a secure secondary relationship?

With deep gratitude to Dr. McIntosh and colleagues and to FCR, I eagerly embrace their advice as it applies to those relatively healthy, mature and child-centered co-parents whom I see professionally. I am newly reassured that when mom and dad can act respectfully, their kids may benefit from that occasional shared Sunday brunch or post-game celebration. I have a new perspective on the child's opportunity to experience her parent's cordial, face to face meeting at transition, and valuable insights into the infant's experience of overnights. Nevertheless, in my work as guardian ad litem, parenting coordinator, custody evaluator and co-parenting facilitator with high conflict parents, I will continue to draw the boundaries firmly and to carefully consider each individual child's needs in an effort to serve his or her opportunity to make and maintain the healthiest relationship possible with each of his or her primary caregivers.

#### Citations

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. New York, NY: basic Books.

Bowlby, R. and McIntosh, J. (2011). John Bowlby's legacy and meanings for the family law field: In conversation with Sir Richard Bowlby. *Family Court Review*, 49(3), 549-556.

Garber, Benjamin D. (2011). Parental alienation and the dynamics of the enmeshed dyad: Adultification, parentification and infantilization. *Family Court Review*, 49(2), 322-335.

Garber, Benjamin D. (2004). Parental alienation in light of attachment theory: Consideration of the broader implications for child development, clinical practice and forensic process. *Journal of Child Custody*, 1(4), 49-76.

Garber, Benjamin D. (2009). Attachment methodology in custody evaluation: Four hurdles standing between developmental theory and forensic application. *Journal of Child Custody*, 6(1&2), 38-61.

George, C., Isaacs, M., and Marvin, R. (2011). Incorporating attachment assessment into custody evaluations: The case of a 2-year-old and her parents. *Family Court Review*, 49(3), 483-500

Lieberman, A., Zeanah, C and McIntosh, J. (2011). ATTACHMENT PERSPECTIVES ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND FAMILY LAW. *Family Court Review*, 49(3), 529-538.

Main, Mary; Hesse, Erik and Hesse, Siegfried (2011). Attachment theory and research: Overview with suggested applications to child custody. *Family Court Review*, 49(3), 426-463.

*Benjamin Garber, Ph.D., is a New Hampshire licensed psychologist, guardian ad litem, parenting coordinator, child and family therapist. Dr. Garber writes and speaks internationally on subjects in child and family*

*development, family conflict and the law. His books Keeping Kids Out Of The Middle (HCI, 2008) and Developmental Psychology For Family Law Professionals (Springer, 2009) speak to those parents and professionals, respectively, invested in better understanding and serving the needs of children. Learn more at [www.HealthyParent.com](http://www.HealthyParent.com).*

6525 Grand Teton Plaza, Madison, WI 53719  
Phone 608.664.3750 Fax 608.664.3751 [afcc@afccnet.org](mailto:afcc@afccnet.org) [www.afccnet.org](http://www.afccnet.org)

[Search - Site Map](#)