







Sara Comments on Daniel's Alice Miller Essay

February, 2007

Author	Message
<p>sara</p> <p>Joined: 03 Feb 2007 Posts: 10</p>	<p>Posted: Fri Feb 09, 2007 4:15 pm Post subject:  quote  edit  ip</p> <hr/> <p>Well Daniel, I suppose this thread is as good as any to comment on your essay about Alice Miller.</p> <p>There is nothing manipulative about Stettbacher's therapy method. You are misleading your readers in the same way Miller did. Miller did not do her basis with a trained follower of Stettbacher. She tried primal therapy, <i>but not Stettbacher's</i>. You better read this interview in Psychologie Heute properly: "Ich halte das, was mir dort zugemutet wurde, für schlicht und einfach unverantwortlich. Am Ende dieser drei Wochen waren meine Gefühle derart aufgewühlt dass ich den Schlaf nicht mehr fand.....Ich fürchtete mich auch schon vor dieser Therapie.... " Yes, she entered the trap of a primal therapist, <i>but not one trained by Stettbacher</i>. "Um aus dieser Falle herauszukommen versuchte ich, mit dem von Stettbacher empfohlenen Konzept zu arbeiten, und es half mir, etwas Ordnung in das durch die Basis entstandene Chaos zu bringen." And then she tells how she wrote hundreds of pages, writing therapy, which helped her to regain her autonomy. <i>Thanks to Stettbacher's concept</i>. "Das Schreiben half mir, meine Autonomie zu erhalten." And further in the interview she tells why she recommended his method: "Die von ihm vertretene Methode leuchtete mir ein, weil sie zunächst das zu vermeiden schien, was ich in der Basis als lebensbedrohend erfuhr: die totale Regression in die frühere Ängste und das ausgeliefert sein an einen Menschen, der diese Abhängigkeit seiner Patienten ausbeutet, der sie als Mittel gebraucht, um seine Unsicherheit zu tarnen." Miller never had a therapist trained by Stettbacher that helped her through therapy. She did her basis with another therapist. She reduced the damage done in her <i>janovian basis</i> with Stettbacher's method.</p> <p>Sara</p>
<p>Daniel Mackler Site Admin</p> <p>Joined: 03 Aug 2006 Posts: 525 Location: New York City</p>	<p>Posted: Sat Feb 10, 2007 11:34 am Post subject:  quote  edit  ip</p> <hr/> <p>sara wrote:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px; margin: 5px 0;"> <p>Well Daniel, I suppose this thread is as good as any to comment on your essay about Alice Miller.</p> </div> <p>Hi Sara. Thanks for the comments, and you've given me a lot to think about. I'd actually like to start this as a new thread, because I think it could be good for that – and won't get lost in the shuffle. If you wish to repost this I will repost my comments below them.</p> <p>sara wrote:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px; margin: 5px 0;"> <p>There is nothing manipulative about Stettbacher's therapy method.</p> </div> <p>I guess we have very different ideas of what manipulative therapy methods are. I outlined in my Alice Miller essay a few tidbits of what I found manipulative in his methods (such as having them huddle in a therapy group in darkness with only flashlights and relive their childhood traumas).</p> <p>Perhaps that is not manipulative to you. To me it falls pretty high on the Manipulative Richter Scale. Out of curiosity, how do you define manipulation in therapy? What do you think would be manipulative?</p> <p>sara wrote:</p>

You are misleading your readers in the same way Miller did.

I don't see the parallel at all. Care to go into more detail?

sara wrote:

Miller did not do her basis with a trained follower of Stettbacher. She tried primal therapy, *but not Stettbacher's*.

I went back and read it and see that you are right here. Thanks. I need to change that in the essay.

That said, I still don't see it as a huge point, certainly not one that changes my point of view about Alice Miller. Clearly Miller worshiped Stettbacher anyway – idealized him and then totally devalued him.

sara wrote:

You better read this interview in Psychologie Heute properly: "Ich halte das, was mir dort zugemutet wurde, für schlicht und einfach unverantwortlich. Am Ende dieser drei Wochen waren meine Gefühle derart aufgewühlt dass ich den Schlaf nicht mehr fand....Ich fürchtete mich auch schon vor dieser Therapie.... " Yes, she entered the trap of a primal therapist, *but not one trained by Stettbacher*. "Um aus dieser Falle herauszukommen versuchte ich, mit dem von Stettbacher empfohlenen Konzept zu arbeiten, und es half mir, etwas Ordnung in das durch die Basis entstandene Chaos zu bringen."

I only have bits of the transition of this interview – and I don't read German. I wish I did.

sara wrote:

Miller never had a therapist trained by Stettbacher that helped her through therapy. She did her basis with another therapist. She reduced the damage done in her *janovian basis* with Stettbacher's method.

Again, thanks for this, and I'll change the essay.

Again, that said, this change is small – and doesn't really touch the basics of my critique of Alice Miller and her point of view.

Best,
Daniel

Daniel Mackler

sara

Posted: Sat Feb 10, 2007 4:57 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Joined: 03
Feb 2007
Posts: 10

Daniel,

There is nothing wrong with having therapy in a dark room. I have therapy in my own darkened bedroom, and I have therapy in the darkened therapy room of my therapist, which by the way is a huge room, not exactly a place where people huddle together. It is obviously hard to believe that a darkened room is just that, a darkened room, and that there are a few people having their own therapy, which is great, because in real life one can have, as a result of this group therapy, help himself under any circumstances. And a flashlight is just that, a light one uses to get out of a darkened room without disturbing the others in their therapy. You seem so eager to make it a trivial, dirty, dangerous business. Why?

Why do you hold such a grudge against Stettbacher that you have to picture him as a

manipulative, greedy nitwit? Is it because you read in Tornton's article (or whatever his name was) that he was manipulative? Did you read it in Masson's book? Or do you condemn him because Miller did not know how to conduct her own therapy and quit? You say a lot about his writing style, but that has nothing to do with his method.

You have your own therapy practice. I suppose you have a concrete therapy method. Highly interactive, you wrote. How interactive? Stettbacher's method is not interactive, therefore it can hardly be called manipulative. The danger of manipulation is in this so-called interactive therapies. How do you interact with your clients and not manipulate them? What makes you so self-righteous? My dictionary says this about self-righteousness: feeling or behaving as if what you say or do is always morally right, and other people are wrong. "As a therapist myself I shuddered at the idea of putting his principles into practice in a therapeutic setting, because it felt so irresponsible – and even outright dangerous." I really wonder what your therapy method looks like.

And why is Alice Miller such a big issue? Why do you have to analyse her, and present this analysis as what, a proof of your enlightenment? Cannot you show a little gratitude because of what she gave to you? Obviously that was not enough. Whatever Miller's reasons were to abandon Stettbacher's therapy method does not give you the right to poke so viciously into her private life.

How about your limits?

Sara

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

Posted: Sat Feb 10, 2007 6:05 pm Post subject:



Joined: 03 Aug 2006
Posts: 525
Location: New York City

Hi Sara,

sara wrote:

There is nothing wrong with having therapy in a dark room. I have therapy in my own darkened bedroom, and I have therapy in the darkened therapy room of my therapist, which by the way is a huge room, not exactly a place where people huddle together. It is obviously hard to believe that a darkened room is just that, a darkened room, and that there are a few people having their own therapy, which is great, because in real life one can have, as a result of this group therapy, help himself under any circumstances. And a flashlight is just that, a light one uses to get out of a darkened room without disturbing the others in their therapy. You seem so eager to make it a trivial, dirty, dangerous business. Why?

I have a very different conception of what healthy therapy is – and I didn't see the therapy as described by Stettbacher as that (though perhaps I did trivialize it unnecessarily with the "huddle" comment). That said, I found it highly directive – perhaps a more clear word than manipulative, but I will still stick with manipulative – and I find that that can undermine a person's healthy sense of himself or herself. As for where you or I or anyone does self-therapy, I have no problem with a darkened room. In professional therapy, though, I see a darkened room as a place that induces primal material to come up in a way that can be very risky. It risks inducing too much transference, and that can easily be exploited by a therapist. My experience is that when therapists set the stage in therapy for quickly inducing deeper transference – such as by working in a darkened room, for example – they are suspect. I wouldn't trust them.

I think there are far more respectful – and less risky – ways of doing therapy.

sara wrote:

Why do you hold such a grudge against Stettbacher that you have to picture him as a manipulative, greedy nitwit?

From what I've read of Stettbacher (his "Making Sense of Suffering Book" primarily, but

also what Alice Miller wrote about him) I have a lot of reservations about him. But a nitwit? No, I never said that, and in fact I remember thinking (and perhaps I wrote this) that I did find some value in what he wrote. And there are a lot of writers about whom I find much less of value.

sara wrote:

Is it because you read in Tornton's article that he was manipulative?

Tornton – you mean Turton? If so, Turton's article largely lists quotations of Alice Miller and Stettbacher and others, and Turton himself writes nothing about Stettbacher.

sara wrote:

Did you read it in Masson's book?

No, in only read Masson's writings on Stettbacher within the past few weeks, and I had already long since come to similar conclusions on my own.

sara wrote:

Or do you condemn him because Miller did not know how to conduct her own therapy and quit?

I used my own judgment – and again, I read his book.

Also, you asked earlier why I condemn him as greedy. Let me ask you this: if Alice Miller didn't know how to "conduct her own therapy" based on his principles – that is, she misunderstood him so much – and yet he paid homage to her in his books, and let her write so glowingly about him for years, and let her bring him fame (and over ten thousand referrals), what do you think was really going through his mind? Perhaps a little greed?

sara wrote:

You say a lot about his writing style, but that has nothing to do with his method.

I wrote very little about his writing style – less than a sentence actually.

sara wrote:

You have your own therapy practice. I suppose you have a concrete therapy method.

Yes and no. It's a flexible method – quite variable and adjustable, which is part of why it's hard to write about. I might, however, try at some point.

sara wrote:

Highly interactive, you wrote. How interactive?

As I wrote, it's highly interactive – much mutuality and sharing, much realness in the relationship. But that only says so much, and it's hard to explain well.

sara wrote:

Stettbacher's method is not interactive, therefore it can hardly be called manipulative.

That is very curious to me, because I've never heard of any therapy at all that is "not interactive." If it's not interactive at all then it's not therapy. Perhaps you are not seeing

the ways in which it is interactive – or perhaps we mean different things by interactive. But I think there can be forms of therapy where the therapist is totally silent – and yet the interaction can be flowing intensely, but all through subtext.

sara wrote:

The danger of manipulation is in this so-called interactive therapies.

I don't agree. Sounds like you've found a simple way to idealize Stettbacher's therapy method.

sara wrote:

How do you interact with your clients and not manipulate them?

I'm not perfect, but I attempt to be upfront with my motives and my purposes, to avoid being directive. But I think non-manipulative therapy reduces ultimately to the level of emotional health of the therapist, and that is something I can never prove to anyone – especially on a web forum.

sara wrote:

What makes you so self-righteous? My dictionary says this about self-righteousness: feeling or behaving as if what you say or do is always morally right, and other people are wrong.

Self-righteous or just more connected with my true self? I believe the latter.

That said, I know I have my limits and blind spots, and I'm working on them. In my mind there is no other deeper point of life.

sara wrote:

And why is Alice Miller such a big issue?

If you have read my website and can't see why Alice Miller – whom I consider to be the best published writer in the psychology field, yet with huge and largely unexplored blind spots – is a "big issue" to me, then I think there's nothing further I can say to sufficiently answer this question for you.

You stated elsewhere that you felt my writing was rhetorical – and yet questions such as this strongly come across that way.

sara wrote:

Why do you have to analyse her, and present this analysis as what, a proof of your enlightenment?

Or perhaps...I'm seeking truth...and want to share what I've found on my journey...

sara wrote:

Cannot you show a little gratitude because of what she gave to you?

Perhaps you haven't noted how much I respect and appreciate her – and how often I state this. Questions like these come across as very black-and-white.

sara wrote:

Whatever Miller's reasons were to abandon Stettbacher's therapy method does not

give you the right to poke so viciously into her private life.

I suggest you re-read the quotation of Alice Miller's that I placed at the top of my essay about her: <http://iraresoul.com/alicemiller.html> I put it there purposefully in case people leveled your very charge against me.

Also, Alice Miller – who is an adult, after all – was the one to share publicly all the information I used to draw my conclusions. I didn't drag this information out of her. I just tied it together using the very methods of analysis I learned...from her!

My sense is that you're still defending the limited parents, and to some degree Alice Miller (and Stettbacher) represent this.

sara wrote:

How about your limits?

Fire away! I'm open to criticism.

Daniel Mackler

sara

□ Posted: Sun Feb 11, 2007 7:58 am Post subject:



Joined: 03
Feb 2007
Posts: 10

It's a bit weird Daniel, you saying that I am trying to defend my limited parents in Miller and Stettbacher, whereas you are accusing them.

I did not defend Miller or Stettbacher. I put a few things straight about Miller's so-called therapy conducted by a stettbacher-trained therapist. I put things straight about the place where I have my therapy and the method I use to help myself. And asked the questions that arose when reading your essay on Miller.

Maybe that's maturity: not having to poke into other lives than my own and that of my parents. Not having to accuse and to analyse others than my parents, my perpetrators. You say you learnt to analyse from Miller. If I analyse you I would say it seems to me you reached, like Miller, your personal limits. That's why she started to analyse Hitler, Ceausescu and others. But they are dead and she did not judge! Are you done analysing your own parents? Or are you stuck there and is it therefore you continue with Miller?

I do not think there is much harm in questioning each other about motives, and asking for clarification in a personal contact, but to me it seems you think a lot in terms of calculation when you are judging and analysing others you do not know personally. You analyse and judge people you do not interact with. They cannot defend themselves, hell, they did not even ask for it! I think it is intrusive the way you try to force Miller into an interaction with you. As if she owes you an explanation for her behaviour.

Sara

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

□ Posted: Sun Feb 11, 2007 12:06 pm Post subject:



Joined: 03
Aug 2006
Posts: 525
Location:
New York
City

bb wrote:

On Dennis' forum [Daniel] wrote:

Quote:

Meanwhile, I still have a desire to have Alice Miller read my long essay about her limits, and probably in part it is motivated by the same thing [*a desire to get revenge on the parents*]. Translation: "grow up Mommy, see me, hear me!" That's a big part of why I'm not sending it to her.

And as you say, it's a **long** essay -- around **sixteen thousand words** long. You certainly discharged a lot of words into that essay. But nevertheless, you

were a latecomer in criticising her support for Stettbacher. Similar criticisms were published on the Internet more than a decade ago. Supporters of the *False Memory Syndrome Foundation* had a field day ripping her reputation to shreds after she published a "Communication To My Readers". The main difference is that they set out to discredit *all* her ideas.

Yes, though I'm not sure I see the point of where you're going with this. Certainly my motivations are not all pure and healthy, as I stated on Dennis's forum (the part you quoted), but that doesn't mean my motivations are all unhealthy either!

As for "discharging" a lot of words, I had no intention of making the essay any longer than I felt it needed to be, and as you may recognize from my other essays I prize brevity. I said what I felt needed to be said, and I don't think I could have done it as effectively with fewer words. Granted, you may not agree with all or many of my conclusions, but I still don't see myself having written that essay as a "discharge."

bb wrote:

Are you really more connected with your true self?

As I said, I believe so. Of course, this is nothing that can be proven.

bb wrote:

The Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines *hubris* as "[exaggerated pride or self-confidence](#)". It might be a good idea to work on those blind spots some more.

Of course it's a good idea for me to work on my blind spots – as I've stated. For me that is the primary purpose of life. But I still feel you underestimate my strengths.

Daniel Mackler

Dennis

Posted: Sun Feb 11, 2007 1:24 pm Post subject:



Joined: 20
Oct 2006
Posts: 140
Location:
Sweden

Child abuse is real. You don't have to look for it with a flashlight. Alice Miller was one of the first persons from the establishment who exposed the real reasons behind child abuse. But it is clear to me that Miller fell in the same traps as she warned for and Daniel made an effort to explain that.

Where does Daniel in his critique on Miller attacks the child? Point that out to me because that's what it is about. Miller and Stettbacher's publications are public and that gives everyone the right to critique that. Daniel did not poke in Miller's private life because he didn't go and interview any of her relatives or friends or spied on her. Why should one only focus on the good values of someone and ignore the bad ones? Isn't that the same behavior that an abused child acts out in order to survive? And doesn't the poisonous pedagogy tell the child that the bad things done to him or her are GOOD things. And isn't this confusion between good and bad what causes suffering?

Masson's critique on Stettbacher is for a part valid. Going to an expensive clinic in Switzerland is hardly a realistic option. In his book it says that the training of many therapists is on the way but 17 years later and I still don't know where to find even one. I know some people have made progress thanks to his book, including me, but it's a sign that he hasn't written more about it. The self-help therapy wasn't convincing to a large amount of people since the clinic received 10,000 applications when his book came out.

Why is this important? Because when you look at the amount of attention that all those other poisonous psychologists, educators, therapies and the pharmaceutical industry get in the media, then we desperately need more people to fight that, including Miller and Stettbacher. And it doesn't have to become a day job. The sales of Miller's books are dropping dramatically with every new book of hers and I guess Daniel and I have tried to

show her shortcomings, hoping that she would again publish a huge bestseller. Because who'll continue after her?

Dennis

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

Joined: 03 Aug 2006
Posts: 525
Location: New York City

Posted: Sun Feb 11, 2007 1:37 pm Post subject:



Hi Sara,

sara wrote:

It's a bit weird Daniel, you saying that I am trying to defend my limited parents in Miller and Stettbacher, whereas you are accusing them.

Can't both be true? At the least I'm trying to critique their flaws.

sara wrote:

I did not defend Miller or Stettbacher.

No?

sara wrote:

I put a few things straight about Miller's so-called therapy conducted by a stettbacher-trained therapist.

Yes – thank you for that.

sara wrote:

I put things straight about the place where I have my therapy and the method I use to help myself.

Yes. And in light of what you wrote I wish to reassess that part of my essay on Alice Miller.

sara wrote:

And asked the questions that arose when reading your essay on Miller.

I think it was more than this – but let others assess that.

sara wrote:

Maybe that's maturity: not having to poke into other lives than my own and that of my parents. Not having to accuse and to analyse others than my parents, my perpetrators.

Certainly you have been analyzing me! And so you know, I don't think it's wrong to do that – though by and large I don't agree with your analysis.

sara wrote:

You say you learnt to analyse from Miller. If I analyse you I would say it seems to me you reached, like Miller, your personal limits. That's why she started to analyse Hitler, Ceausescu and others.

Interesting points. I see her analysis of Hitler as brilliant and innovative and not a reflection of her stuckness or projections, rather a reflection of her gifts. As time went on, though, I see her continued analysis of others – the endless case studies – as being more

reflective of her stuckness.

As for me reaching my limits – I hope not!!!

sara wrote:

But they [Hitler, Ceausescu] are dead and she did not judge!

Others may know better than I do, but I believe she did analyze some living people in her writings. Didn't she analyze Saddam Hussein, for example, before he died?

And that said, what's so wrong with analyzing someone while they're still alive? Maybe by conventional standards it's considered impolite, but by conventional standards it's also okay to abuse one's own children...

As to the question of "judgment," I don't agree with you here. I see judgment as a matter of perspective. Perhaps you see my whole website as judgmental. I write what I think is wrong in the world – or most specifically with most parents – and I write what I think should be done to make it right. My experience, though, shows me that people call something "judgmental" when they don't agree with the assessment, regardless of whether or not the assessment is correct. On the flip side, if they do agree with the assessment, no matter harsh it seems, they don't label it judgmental.

That's why I tend to avoid the term judgmental. It's too loaded.

sara wrote:

Are you done analysing your own parents?

No. As I've written, I still have unresolved childhood traumas. And you?

sara wrote:

Or are you stuck there and is it therefore you continue with Miller?

Part of me is stuck, yes, but I see that stuckness as only a fraction of my motivation for analyzing Alice Miller. Perhaps this fraction represents a larger degree than I able to recognize, but I still believe it is only a fraction.

And you in your analysis of me?

sara wrote:

I do not think there is much harm in questioning each other about motives, and asking for clarification in a personal contact, but to me it seems you think a lot in terms of calculation when you are judgeing and analysing others you do not know personally.

So be it – again, it sounds like you just don't agree much with my analyses or point of view. Or am I missing something? Perhaps you agree with a lot of what I'm writing and just are not sharing our overlap.

If not, let me ask you then, for clarification: beyond setting the record straight about a few points on my Alice Miller essay (such as her not being in therapy with a Stettbacher-trained therapist) what motivates you to come here? I would be curious.

sara wrote:

You analyse and judge people you do not interact with.

As if it's a crime to analyze!

Again, this question of interaction... Perhaps in your mind no one has any right to analyze or critique anyone else unless they meet them in person, but again, that leads me to ask you...why then do you feel comfortable analyzing me?

That said, I am learning from your critiques of me. It's a bit stressful – but it challenges me to think outside the box.

sara wrote:

They cannot defend themselves, hell, they did not even ask for it! I think it is intrusive the way you try to force Miller into an interaction with you. As if she owes you an explanation for her behaviour.

Whoa – you're taking a leap here. Who said I tried to force Alice Miller into an interaction? I never did. Yet even if I had – would that have been so bad?! I don't think so. I just looked within and decided that it wasn't worth it to me to reach out to her directly, and all the more so after I saw how she behaved toward Dennis on her now-defunct web forum.

Also, one might say that you're "forcing" me into an interaction far more than I'm "forcing" Alice Miller into one – and yet, despite the stress of it, I'm welcoming it. That's why I have a web forum, and even a whole section devoted to critiques of my point of view. I'm glad you're here.

Also, Alice Miller can defend herself just fine – if she wishes. She's an adult and has been fending off critics for years (both the healthy and the unhealthy ones), and she doesn't seem to be the worse for wear because of it.

Also, she's more than welcome to come on here and answer (that is, defend against) my criticisms of her. Konrad Stettbacher is welcome here too. Actually, I would be curious to know what happened to him. It sounds like he really got run out town professionally with the sexual harassment lawsuit he went through.

Best,
Daniel

Daniel Mackler

sara

Posted: Sun Feb 11, 2007 3:52 pm Post subject:



Joined: 03
Feb 2007
Posts: 10







Daniel,







I do not suppose you asked me what has become of Konrad Stettbacher..... Could it be possible you are angry with me and punch at him? I do not find you very direct.

I came to this forum because I found your essay in Wikipedia. I love to roam the internet when I do not work. I never participated in forums until I read your Miller paper. I do not like to get tangled up in discussions. I'm usually a rather easy-going person, but there was some plain stupidity in your paper that made me angry. I went to your website and read more. I joined your message board and soon I knew I shouldn't have.

I do not like your essays. They are scary and rather revealing. In one of them you say this: "People who are dissociated are quite motivated, sophisticated, and convincing. But this is only because they perennially risk returning to suffering if they do not convince everyone of their lie. Enlightenment brings a motivation to spread the truth that is everyone's birthright." You fit the profile perfectly, hence the self-righteousness.

Daniel, you blame Stettbacher for being directive although you never understood what his directives were about. But look at your essay with the eleven reasons not to have children! The shoulds and the should nots, directives by Daniel Mackler. It's almost creepy.

	<p>You asked about my childhood trauma's. I have plenty left, probably enough for the rest of my life to deal with.</p> <p>Sara</p>
<p>bb</p> <p>Joined: 10 Aug 2006 Posts: 26</p>	<p>Posted: Mon Feb 12, 2007 5:34 am Post subject:  quote  edit  IP</p> <hr/> <p>Daniel wrote > <i>Yes, though I'm not sure I see the point of where you're going with this.</i></p> <p>Reply: I'm not saying the points in your Miller essay are wrong, just that I feel your better essays are the shorter ones. I am not in a position to know your strengths in general because the essays & forum posts are all I have to go on. The World Wide Web is drowning in long-winded articles. Short essays which make an impact are harder to find. The part of your Miller essay which says something new could be extracted from the lengthy Stettbacher analysis and presented as an easy-to-digest nugget.</p> <p>Dennis wrote > <i>The sales of Miller's books are dropping dramatically...</i></p> <p>Reply: The rankings of Miller's books on Amazon have declined. Her latest, <i>Bilder Meines Lebens</i>, hasn't been translated into English. It seems to me that <i>Paths of Life</i> made a bad impression because she disguised her own life -- she didn't present the vignettes as autobiographical. I haven't read <i>The Body Never Lies</i> because it's based around biographical sketches of characters who, for the most part, are only of historical interest. They grew up in an era where parenting styles were harsher -- to the the extent that they don't resonate with today's generation of young parents. I think she needs to examine the childhood backgrounds of present day cultural icons, as other authors have done. I mean icons more recent than Marilyn Monroe, who died in the early 1960s.</p> <p>Usually, I buy books from Amazon. Until a few weeks ago, I hadn't visited the nearest large bookstore for many months. I discovered that they expanded the biographies section and added a separate rack labelled "Painful Lives." So there must be a large potential audience, even in a city with less than 120,000 inhabitants.</p> <hr/> <p>Bookish</p>
<p>Daniel Mackler Site Admin</p> <p>Joined: 03 Aug 2006 Posts: 525 Location: New York City</p>	<p>Posted: Thu Feb 15, 2007 3:02 pm Post subject:  quote  edit  IP</p> <hr/> <p>sara wrote:</p> <div data-bbox="391 1318 1373 1367" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>I do not suppose you asked me what has become of Konrad Stettbacher.....</p> </div> <p>Do you know? I would be curious. I can only speculate that Alice Miller at least partially destroyed his career in the mid-1990s.</p> <p>sara wrote:</p> <div data-bbox="391 1535 1373 1682" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>Daniel, you blame Stettbacher for being directive although you never understood what his directives were about. But look at your essay with the eleven reasons not to have children! The shoulds and the should nots, directives by Daniel Mackler. It's almost creepy.</p> </div> <p>Interesting point, but misguided for one basic reason: I'm trying to shed light on how to stop people from having children when they will only traumatize them, whereas Stettbacher is setting down parameters for therapy that crash through defenses and dig as quickly as possible in therapy into patient's primal material (which I think is inappropriate and seriously risks traumatizing people). I cannot see how my list of eleven situations in which is it's inappropriate for people to have children could possible traumatize anyone. Perhaps it could threaten some people who don't meet the criteria and don't want to view</p>

	<p>themselves in that light, but traumatize people? – hardly!</p> <hr/> <p>Daniel Mackler</p>
<p>Daniel Mackler Site Admin</p> <p>Joined: 03 Aug 2006 Posts: 525 Location: New York City</p>	<p>Posted: Thu Feb 15, 2007 3:19 pm Post subject:   </p> <hr/> <p>bb wrote:</p> <div data-bbox="391 384 1373 464" style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>I'm not saying the points in your Miller essay are wrong, just that I feel your better essays are the shorter ones.</p> </div> <p>I heard you make that point in another post, too, and I think there's some real validity to it.</p> <p>bb wrote:</p> <div data-bbox="391 632 1373 779" style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>The World Wide Web is drowning in long-winded articles. Short essays which make an impact are harder to find. The part of your Miller essay which says something new could be extracted from the lengthy Stettbacher analysis and presented as an easy-to-digest nugget.</p> </div> <p>I may take your advice here and cut it down – or boil it down to its most salient points. I think what I might do is present both essays, the long and the short version, for people who might be interested.</p> <p>The thing is, though, although (you say) the Stettbacher information has been presented elsewhere, I never read it, and couldn't really find it elsewhere (or perhaps didn't know where to look), so there might be people out there for whom my essay is the first critique of Miller they've heard. I wrote my essay for people who read only her books, basically, and didn't know too much else. I wrote it with the idea of how valuable it would have been for me to have read about five or six years ago...</p> <p>But I still think your idea is a good one, and I may test it out at some point.</p> <p>Thanks, Daniel.</p> <hr/> <p>Daniel Mackler</p>
<p>Dennis</p> <p>Joined: 20 Oct 2006 Posts: 140 Location: Sweden</p>	<p>Posted: Thu Feb 15, 2007 8:11 pm Post subject:   </p> <hr/> <p>Funny that the letter to the Pope is removed from Miller's website. But some other world leaders are still mentioned. BB, you say I wasn't tactful, but also know that the way we write on the computer differs from handwriting. The plain computer text never reveals anything of the emotional state it was written in. When you read, the voice in your head may emphasize certain words that the writer didn't and different interpretations may be the result of it. What was appalling to me was the fact that Miller didn't give me a chance to explain more and she was the one who wasn't tactful. The infamous paragraph I wrote was:</p> <p><i>My experiences are that people can use the books of Alice Miller to defend themselves against pain. The wish to be heard can last a lifetime if it's not connected to your own parents from your childhood. Addressing authorities such as presidents and other leaders originates from the wish to change our parents (the authority). Change doesn't come from anyone else but yourself. The question is how much space we get to make that change. I heard once someone saying that the only thing he could do to make this world a better place was to live a good life and then hope that your neighbor will respond to that and do the same.</i></p>

I meant to say at that time that it's something she ought to investigate more. It's sad to see people reading her books and still abuse their child.

Here you can read [Miller's open letter to the Pope](#)

Dennis