



Lou Hillier
Private Consultant
Chartered Psychologist
Light House Psychology
Rosemead Cottage
Spetisbury DT11 9DW
United Kingdom

Analysis of Dr.G's Analysis Video on Zachariah Anderson

Dr.G makes two fatal errors throughout, detailed below, which invalidate everything he tries to project onto Zach. Dr.G completely failed to account for or even acknowledge these two major factors that influenced Zach's words and behaviour at the sentencing hearing:

- 1) He failed to establish a baseline for Zach and without a baseline nothing Dr.G says has any validity.
- 2) a) He failed to take into consideration the effects of the extreme context/conditions that Zach has been living under for the last 2-3 years, conditions which the vast majority of human beings will never experience in their lifetimes. Dr.G failed to acknowledge or show any psychological understanding of the effects being incarcerated and isolated from loved ones will have on a person. He failed to acknowledge or show any psychological understanding of the effects on a person of being in prison clothes, in chains and in front of a judge who has complete power and facing a long to-be-decided prison sentence. He failed to notice or acknowledge that Zach was choosing his words very carefully and that he was not free to say what he wanted to, due to restraints imposed by advice from his attorneys and also knowing that if he said something that 'upset' the Judge he could end up with a more severe sentence.
- 2 b) He failed to acknowledge or show any psychological understanding for the fact that Zach has had nearly 3 years to think about and rehearse what he might say, and, therefore neither Zach's speech nor his presentation of that speech will have been spontaneous but carefully thought out. Speeches that have been rehearsed and where the person is not free to express themselves openly and without censure cannot be analysed in the usual way. Failing to acknowledge these contextual factors makes Dr.G's analysis doubly invalid.

Some specific accusations require additional comment:

1. *Accuses Zach of only trying to appear happy, because the smile is only on one side of his face.*

The camera shot was a side-view of Zach as he was coming into court and gesturing to his family/friends, so this observation is moot, he doesn't know what the other side of Zach's whole face was doing. That aside, Dr.G's implication that "*trying to appear happy*" is somehow a negative against Zach without giving a reason is highly questionable and I would suggest fails to understand even the basics of human psychology. I would assume the opposite, that Zach is showing his sensitivity to his family/friends in concealing for their benefit how upset he might feel on the inside, and also I would interpret 'trying to

appear happy' as 'putting on a brave face', which is the behaviour of a functional and emotionally competent human being as a way of trying to maintain some semblance of healthy self-esteem for himself, and those who care about him, in such extremely distressing circumstances.

2. *Accuses Zach of being a psychopath.*

This happens less than 90 seconds into the video. Dr.G calls Zach a type of psychopath that is *manipulative, superficially charming and charismatic*. Firstly, these are not criteria on their own for being any type of psychopath. Secondly, what evidence was provided to justify giving the label of psychopath to Zach? Answer: None, apart from Dr. G saying he knows that "*not everyone feels this way about him [Zach] but a lot of people do seem to."* So, this supposed licenced psychologist is asserting that Zach is a psychopath without ever having met him nor establishing a baseline nor speaking to any of his friends or family, and he has based it purely on what *he thinks* a lot of other people 'seem' to feel. Dr. G requires refresher training as he seems to have forgotten his most basic undergraduate training, that feelings are unreliable sources of information and often wildly inaccurate and unreliable. Thirdly, every single human being alive is practiced in the art of influencing or 'manipulating' other people and situations to some degree as we navigate the world and try to get our needs met. Being able to influence or 'manipulate' to some level is part of being a functional person. There does come a point where the level of manipulation exceeds what would be deemed functional and healthy, including when the manipulation is at the expense of others or for other harmful purposes. Dr.G has provided no evidence to back up his claims that Zach shows a psychopathological degree of manipulation of others. The same can be said for the accusations of Zach being '*superficially charming*' and '*charismatic*' – these are characteristics that almost every human being has to some degree and it is a sign of being socially competent when someone is able to be charming and has some charisma, whether it is superficial or not is not a judgement that a stranger can make, no matter their profession or qualifications. People without charm or charisma will often struggle to form and maintain relationships both socially and in the work-place and often find themselves isolated, alone and with poor mental health. It is egregiously outside his scope of competence for Dr.G to attempt to label Zach as a '*psychopath*' and grounds to report Dr.G to his licensing body.

3. *Characteristics of the type of psychopath Dr.G has diagnosed Zach as being:*

a) *nonchalance, being calm and composed, showing a lack of emotion, he may come across as disinterested/bored* – None of these behaviours can in anyway be taken as indicating psychopathology or that someone is a psychopath, this is simply Dr.G projecting his own self-objects and subjective beliefs onto Zach. This is also an example of Dr.G ascribing to himself mind-reading capabilities that no human being has and is actually a sign of Dr.G's dysfunction and narcissism. Dr.G does not have sufficient knowledge of Zach to make any of these observations reliable, so all we get from his observations are a reflection of who Dr.G is, and they tell us nothing about Zach at all, in my view. I personally would make the observation that Zach being able to remain calm and composed under what must be immense emotional duress, indicate he has good social and emotional intelligence and above average levels of self-control. Especially, that he is aware that his family/friends are watching and being mindful of their feelings, that they will not want to see Zach falling apart, even if that is how he might have felt on the inside. My observations would be that Zach showed significant empathy and appropriate emotional responsiveness towards others and what was happening in court during sentencing and throughout the trial. This observation is supported from reviewing multiple public comments made by his family and friends, and I would offer it as irrefutable evidence that Zach is NOT a psychopath.

b) manipulative charm and willing to breach boundaries – as discussed above, I interpret this as another invalid observation as there is no evidence provided that Zach's reactions are anything other than within functional and normal limits of human behaviour. Additionally, Dr.G infantilises the people he is accusing Zach of nefariously manipulating and breaching boundaries with, predominantly his female lawyer. Dr.G is implying that she is too stupid to realise if someone is trying to manipulate her or intrude on her boundaries and that she is too helpless and enfeebled to defend herself and to continue to behave professionally. Not only is this sexist and belittling towards Zach's attorney, Dr.G again shows no psychological understanding of human nature nor of professional relationships and instead seems to vastly underestimate and denigrate others whilst simultaneously elevating himself as the all-knowing authority, which is classic narcissistic behaviour.

c) narcissism, he probably believes he's the smartest guy in the room, and that he will outwit everyone else (accuses Zach of calculating how he wants to appeal the case) – Again, Dr.G provides no evidence for his observations, he cannot read Zach's mind (nor anyone else's mind), so this is just more of Dr.G's self-objects that he is projecting out of himself and onto his target for denigration, in this case Zach. I would therefore suggest that this is an embedded self-confession, Dr.G is telling us without realising it, that it is himself who is the narcissist and that it is Dr.G who thinks he is the smartest guy in the room. He does not have sufficient knowledge to make these assertions about Zach, they are coming from within Dr.G himself, they are all Dr.G's self-objects. His comments are nothing to do with Zach, they are Dr.G unconsciously describing himself and outing himself as a manipulative, calculating narcissist. As for his specific accusation that Zach is "*calculating*" how to appeal the case, where Dr.G uses the word "*calculating*" to imply some perverse and devious intent, this just shows Dr.G's ignorance of how trials and attorneys work and illustrates Dr.G's own twisted character in my opinion. The reality is that Zach and his lawyers will have been exploring together reasons to appeal since the verdict, if not before, and this is entirely normal and functional behaviour. All Dr.G is doing here is adding his biased and pejorative language in order to persuade the viewer/listener that Dr.G is 'good man right' and Zach is 'bad man wrong'. This is purely showing us who Dr.G is – it is Dr.G who is being dysfunctionally manipulative at the expense of others for his own nefarious reasons, trying to paint someone else as 'bad man wrong' so he can bask in the glory of being "*the smartest guy in the room*".

d) lack of genuine remorse – the glaring mistake made in this observation is that Zach cannot be remorseful for something he did not do. That Dr.G did not even mention the possibility that Zach may not show remorse because he has done nothing to feel remorseful about is a gross omission and is indicative of Dr.G's dysfunction and his biased, lazy and distorted thought processes.

e) disrespect – Dr.G said because of Zach's facial expressions he was being disrespectful and this is a sign he's a psychopath. Really? Being disrespectful towards others cannot in anyway be taken as a sign/symptom of being a psychopath. If it were then every human being on the planet is a psychopath because all of us from time to time pull faces or roll our eyes or are flippant or rude to others. Including this element is a sign of desperation and grasping at straws on the part of Dr.G, it proves he's got nothing of value to support any of his accusations and he is, again, just projecting his own self-objects – this has nothing to do with Zach, it's just another example of an embedded confession from Dr.G, he is unconsciously telling us that it is he who does not have respect for other people, not for Zach, not for his viewers and likely no one else.

f) calculating, he is paying attention to peoples reactions and thinking about his next move. Functional human beings pay attention to others, we listen and modify our behaviour in response to what we see and hear, this is entirely normal behaviour. Again, Dr.G is using pejorative words like "calculate" to

manipulate others and imply devious intent because Dr.G needs to persuade away from the reality that Zach is a normal guy. Dr.G is doing this either for his own nefarious and devious reasons (for views and likes or to make himself feel better about who he is by denigrating another) and because he is just too lazy, ignorant and/or unskilled to be able to conduct a proper analysis. In reality, Zach behaved like a well-adjusted and sensitive human being coping admirably with extraordinarily adverse circumstances.

4. In relation to Zach's attorney, Dr.G accuses Zach of doing these things indicating an inappropriate relationship existed and it was all Zach's fault:

a) looking at his attorney 'manipulatively' – what evidence does Dr.G give to support his assertion that a look can be 'manipulative'? Answer: none. What explanation does Dr.G give for how to tell the difference between a manipulative look and a non-manipulative look? Answer: none. So, yet again, all this is is Dr.G's projecting his prejudice and, in my opinion, his own dysfunction on to Zach, likely to make Dr.G feel better about himself and to make up for his own unacknowledged inadequacies.

b) looking at her chest, then looking her in the eye again. – This is another non-sequitur argument, behind which there is no logic or evidence of devious intent but Dr.G implies it nonetheless. Looking at an out-of-the-ordinary physical feature another person has is something that we all do. It's unavoidable and entirely functional and normal behaviour when someone has a feature about them that is eye-catching in some way, other people will notice it, and to notice they will look. Period. I would estimate there were approximately zero people who did not notice Nicole's chest.

c) trying to act nonchalant and cool – again, no evidence provided to support this assertion, just an implication that this 'behaviour' was nefarious and negative to shore-up Dr.G's baseless conclusion that Zach is 'bad man wrong' and Dr.G trying to see himself as 'good man right'. It shows to me, again, that it is adept at Dr.G deluding himself that he has the ability to read minds, which no one has, and further confirming to me that it is Dr.G who has the narcissistic tendencies.

d) being flirtatious and seductive – more projection and assertions made with no supporting evidence and failing to see the benign nature of the interactions between Zach and his attorney tells us about Dr.G's psychopathology and tells us nothing about Zach. Dr.G is either being insincere and playing directly to his dysfunctional audience of 'wino moms' by deliberately misinterpreting and misrepresenting innocent behaviour in a way that reflects their own psychopathology (and his in my view) by telling them what they want to hear about 'bad man wrong' for clicks and views, or Dr.G's is demonstrating his own inner dysfunction and complete incompetence as a psychologist by attributing malignant intent to other people's benign behaviour with no evidence or justification whatsoever.

In conclusion, there is nothing of value in the points that Dr.G tried to make. On the contrary, all he showed was that he has a strong need to persuade, to manipulate and control what other people think, projecting his own 'bad man wrong' self-objects onto an unsuspecting other, in this case Zach, to make himself feel better about who his is. His entire analysis is a form of embedded confession that the very things Dr.G is accusing Zach of is simply Dr.G unconsciously describing himself. Everything he accuses Zach of are his own self-objects, they come from within him and they belong to him.

As a final note, I wonder what secrets Dr.G may be hiding about his own character and conduct when he thinks no one is looking? I would speculate that sexual deviance may be a possibility due to Dr.G's hyper-focus on the relationship between Zach and his attorney and repeated references to 'seduction' and Dr.G's indirect sexualisation of that relationship. I conclude that it is Dr.G who has shown us the ugly

interior of his own dysfunctional, manipulative and narcissistic character, that he has projected on to Zach as a vain attempt to escape his own flaws and inadequacies.

As I mentioned above, in my opinion, it is egregiously outside his scope of Dr.G's competence for him to attempt this analysis and to label Zach as a '*psychopath*' is, in my opinion, grounds to report Dr.G to his licensing body.