







A response to my critique of the work of Elnora Van Winkle

November, 2006

Author	Message
<p>Dennis</p> <p>Joined: 20 Oct 2006 Posts: 140 Location: Sweden</p>	<p>☐ Posted: Sun Nov 19, 2006 2:18 pm Post subject: An Assessment Of The Self-Therapy Methods of Van Winkle   </p> <hr/> <p>Daniel, thanks for putting so much time in exploring this further. This puts a unique perspective on Van Winkle and her works. First of all, I've enjoyed the interview, it was honest and unusual.</p> <p>The scientific explanation by Grace Jackson is a bit beyond my ability to understand. Maybe I've to read it again.</p> <p>Your critique is however spot on. There's no way around it, she was delusional and in denial and far from cured. I guess after my delusions with Alice Miller in 2001, I was unknowingly searching for a replacement, someone who took it to the next step. I recognized the emphasize on anger (and grieve) in her method because that's what I had been doing so much and which caused the most intense abuse I received in my childhood. I was happy to see it confirmed that my rightful anger towards my parents was justified. I also kept seeing repression confirmed in other people who were unable to physically express their anger and hatred to the causers. But grieve is indeed a very important factor, too. And the other suppressed emotions. Van Winkle presented some missing pieces of the puzzle to me. She also emphasized that it was not the trauma that needed to be relived, but the (repressed) expression towards that trauma. Something that Alice Miller also stated. And how struggling relationships are often a repeat of the struggles we had as a child.</p> <p>I removed Van Winkle from the introduction page on my forum. She made some valuable statements, but not exclusively. If she was wrong about her toxic brain theory, the basis of her method falls through. She is valuable within the theories of Primal, but nothing that she exclusively discovered.</p> <p>Dennis</p> <hr/> <p>Yes, there's another forum dealing with Alice Miller's findings... www.wallsofsilence.com</p>
<p>Daniel Mackler Site Admin</p> <p>Joined: 03 Aug 2006 Posts: 523 Location: New York City</p>	<p>☐ Posted: Sun Nov 19, 2006 2:35 pm Post subject:   </p> <hr/> <p>Dear Dennis,</p> <p>Thanks for your comments. I admit, I was nervous opening up this posting because I wasn't sure if you were going to blast me for what I wrote about Van Winkle. It's a relief to see that what I wrote made sense to you. It's interesting, because I have nothing but good feelings for Ellie Van Winkle as a person. Fred Timm also showed me some photographs of her from the mid-1980s, and she looks like a lovely person – "a good soul," as he describes her. Her warmth, genuine nature, and vulnerability come through the photos. The problem is, I just feel it's important to tell the truth about people – and about myself.</p> <p>I have made certain decisions regarding keeping most aspects of my personal life personal on this web forum, so it might come across as hypocritical for me to pick apart the personal lives of others, and I sometimes feel a guilt about</p>

this. With Van Winkle, though, she has been dead for over five years, so I feel that is acceptable. Also, I have no intention of leaving my personal story told forever. I have actually written a huge amount of it down, in excruciating detail, both in ways that tells the truth about my traumatizers and also tells the truth about the ways – both very healthy and very unhealthy – that I reacted to it. But I can't see publishing it anytime soon – my thought is that it's decades and decades away. Perhaps after I and many others have died. I don't know.

I justify writing my critiques of Alice Miller because I am only analyzing publicly available information. If she told me personal and hidden information I would not share it. Others have told me personal information, and some things that would greatly back up certain arguments of mine – and some of these people have even given me the freedom to publish their confidences – but I still feel it is important to keep the confidence.

So this is something of a tangent. My main point is that I thank you for taking the time to read my critique of the work and life of Van Winkle. I feel she is close to the truth in some great ways, but also so off the mark in some ways that have fooled people that it is important to separate the wheat from the chaff. Also, it was a challenge to assess the life's work of someone and do it as succinctly as possible.

I also felt some sorrow about blasting someone that people respect, but I put myself in the shoes of others: I find it important to hear the truth, even if it hurts. And that of course assumes that what I have told about her is the truth: regardless, it's just my best interpretation!

As to the Grace Jackson paper, I don't understand the science of it either, at least not too well, but that's part of the point for me: Elnora Van Winkle didn't understand the science that she was toying with, and clearly she was really only toying with the science, not really assessing it correctly. Regardless, I am very grateful to Grace Jackson for putting the time into studying Van Winkle's hypotheses and taking them seriously. It seems no one else was really doing it.

One last point: I really don't know that much about primal therapy. So I believe that's a weakness in my Van Winkle piece. I just did my best, but I leaned more heavily on the material that I did know. Regardless, in some ways I wish Van Winkle were alive and could write a rebuttal. But if she were alive I wouldn't have written the piece. So that's life's compromise.

Regardless, again, thank you for your reply.

Best,
Daniel

P.S. I just put a few more Grace Jackson links on the Grace Jackson bio page

I feel it's important to have Grace Jackson's credibility be known, and not just have people take my word for it!

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

Cesar Tort

Posted: Sun Nov 19, 2006 7:11 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  ip

Joined: 02 Aug
2006

Terrific work on Ellie Van Winkle, Daniel! You certainly have a clearest mind to understand people. In fact, now I see I was wrong in my first evaluation of your

Posts: 394
Location: Mexico
City

Miller essay.

Daniel wrote:

It is no wonder that few, if any, scientists took her seriously, because she violates the basic principles of science, just as delusional people violate the basic principles of reality.

That's what I wrote in other thread: that even before reading the essays you posted today in your website, Ellie reminded me the writings of Martin Gardner. The "hermit scientist," Gardner wrote in a classic book about pseudoscientists, works alone and is ignored by mainstream scientists. "Such neglect, of course, only strengthens the convictions of the self-declared genius"

Van Winkle **wrote:**

it is not necessary to connect the specifics of current interactions with specifics of past trauma, but only to accept that you have repressed anger

Wrong! I believe I have demonstrated in my own life that a thorough autobiography is one of the most helpful ways to integrate the self, something that Ellie Van Winkle didn't do fully.

Daniel wrote:

Van Winkle counsels people to beware of confronting parents or parental figures too harshly for fear of losing one's inheritance [...]. it speaks of holding back your truth and anger when it suits you financially!

The opposite of what Ellie believed is true. It's better to be poor and integrated for having confronted parents than expecting an inheritance and be dissociated.

Daniel wrote:

That said, Van Winkle underestimates the role of grieving, probably in large part because she did much less grieving than raging and thus understood it much less and could give it little more than lip service. A simple search of her 1,098 postings on her web forum brings up 642 posts containing the word "anger," 225 with the word "angry," 133 with "rage," and a mere 101 for "crying," ninety-eight for "grief," eight for "grieving," and only two for "mourning."

Very perceptive. It's curious that Revaluation and Co-counseling (RC) therapies focus on crying. But like Ellie's therapy, RC is cultish. I much prefer Colin Ross' non-cultish therapies. Besides, he integrates both: anger and crying.

Daniel wrote:

the milder varieties, which, oddly enough, she claims formed her personal childhood experience [...]. but something also massively blocked her way. I suspect Van Winkle gave up her healing process in a big way, and just dissociated instead to find her seeming peace and pleasure in life. According to Fred Timm (personal communication, 2006), Van Winkle used her very theories to *bolster* her unconscious justification for *not* facing her childhood issues, and just used them to hide from the deeper truth

Ditto. It happened to me. I engaged in a five-year research to debunk pseudoscientific psychiatry at the expense of continuing my autobiographical

writing. The result is that I am the foremost psychiatry critic in Mexico but, I realize now, I didn't want to write the books that disturb me the most: what my father did to me (something far worse of what I posted in the thread about my mother's witch-doctor and her drugs). All those years in research were almost a waste of time compared to the books about my dad I must now write.

Daniel wrote:

After all, dissociation (that is, being split-off from one's deeper self and traumas) mimics enlightenment. Even Oliver Sacks noted this phenomenon, in the case of a severely brain damaged man who became worshiped by his Hare Krishna associates because they mistook his declining mental state and seeming retardation for enlightenment! [Sacks, 1995.]

Agreed! I read Sacks' book and I have seen this phenomenon many, many times when I read the lives of so-called saints, gurus and New Age personalities.

Daniel wrote:

I find it highly unlikely that it is the whole story. My experience has shown me that people like Van Winkle who develop schizophrenia and engage in severe drug abuse and marry alcoholic gamblers and remain on psychiatric disability for decades and end up isolated and alone in their lives almost always experienced horrible childhood abuse, if only emotional, though much worse than what Van Winkle described and certainly from which she never recovered.

Again, I insist that we must write down our whole abuse story. It's incredible the bits of trauma I have recovered by doing that: bits that would have remained completely dissociated from my consciousness before I embarked in writing.

All this said, I am grateful to Ellie. Thanks to her advice your friend Fred became acquainted with Miller's work, and then you also, and then you developed a higher consciousness, and then you contacted me thru internet. Without Ellie we might never had met in cyberspace!

Daniel: I believe that your essays and interviews will be considered classics for Ellie Van Winkle studies. Congrats for your hard work!

P.S. Have you thought of writing a Van Winkle article for Wikipedia? Now that you have done the homework, writing an encyclopedic article or even a mere stub would be much easier.

Cesar

John

Posted: Sun Nov 19, 2006 9:38 pm Post subject:



Joined: 22 Oct 2006
Posts: 269

Daniel,

I'm not all that clear as to why you would invest time in analyzing this in the way that you have. It's as if you feel that by analyzing what has been said and written and VanWinkle's feeble stabs at trying to understand what actually is happening in the brain that something about RST will actually be revealed. A year ago I received something from an eminent neurologist in Germany who said ..."It's a wonder we understand anything at all regarding what is

happening in the human brain. It is a symphony of billions of events occurring all at once. I very much doubt what she has written is very accurate". And that was that. At least he answered.

If you want to get an idea of what it's like when discussing what's going on in the brain, have a look into the multi-billion dollar SSRI-NRI industry. These are approved drugs. All of them. When you see the write-ups on these they say..."this is how it might work".

VanWinkle's understanding of codependency is excellent. And creating a codependency map (for me) is what has made RST such a successful therapy. As you trail down Grace's paper, you can see point after point coming up with the same conclusions that they come up with regarding the exact nature (proven) of how SSRIs work. They have a pretty good idea, and they have done lots of studies with some verifiable results (due to the massive amounts of money involved), but they are not sure. All they know is that it *works*. And that it is the cash cow of the millennium for psychiatry.

RST is the same. Unlike other authors (such as Bradshaw and Miller) I never really looked into VanWinkle. Why? Because my experience (for the first time ever) was actually based on doing something...not thinking and analysing.

Why would it be that doing RST creates spots on your skin? 22 hour hangovers? Rashes under eyes and nose (read Cure by Crying). Why does it virtually knock out negative addictive codependent reference groups? Why does it cut compulsions down drastically? Why why why? Answer? Nobody here TRULY cares. Nobody is asking that.

When I made a list of my old girlfriends, and then lay down on my bed and raged in my mind at my mother for each one (using this as a one hour session), why did I get a histamine response? Why does using RST late in the evening create an immediate relaxation response? ONLY if using redirecting. Try pounding on a bed at the person who you are mad at without making the codependency map. No histamine response....no real relief.

What is going on neurologically? The chemical reactions people get doing this therapy are dramatic. The people I know who have done this are not delusional. They don't have schizophrenia. I understand the thinking behind the person who has put up www.gocure.com They used the therapy, were relieved of 30 years of anxiety disorder, and did the free site as a tribute.

As I read and read, I could see that the entire review (entirely) was intellectual. This seems to be much of the "culture" of this forum. Analysis and talk. I understand it, because I am the biggest expert of all on analysis!

I found this review to be unsatisfactory. It was all "burden of proof, burden of proof, burden of proof". A person truly interested in this therapy could easily investigate and try out some of it's methods to see if it works. I don't feel this large amount of writing with the "referenced" look does RST justice. If I was a person with depression, anxiety disorder or CFS, I'd read this and BELIEVE IT. And just keep going!

In that sense Daniel, by focusing on VanWinkle and the "science" alone, you have ignored the therapy and what it has to offer. In your own particular case you may be sleeping well and able to work, with a good balance mentally. You can afford to do what you have done. Many people (such as myself) were not in that position.

You didn't investigate this thoroughly, although you certainly have made it seem like you have. I don't think there is any bad intention in that, I think you believe it's a thorough investigation. Reviewing it with intellect and analysis.

John

Dennis

Posted: Mon Nov 20, 2006 5:37 am Post subject:



Joined: 20 Oct 2006
Posts: 140
Location: Sweden

John, the interview shows that Van Winkle lied about being cured, about being post-flood. I'm not going to promote a therapy where people end up as liars about their own condition.

But everything that does work in her therapy, her method, is just plain Primal Therapy. Except she calls priming Re-Directing. John, what you have experienced is Primal, making emotional connections. What could be important is to notice the speed of which Van Winkle worked. Maybe her method was simply too fast, and the body (and mind) built new defenses over time. Reading how she spent her last year, does suggest this very much. Stettbacher's method at least adds a few steps before the re-directing occurs. Van Winkle also stayed pretty silent about the abuse she suffered as an older child.

Van Winkle was experimenting with primal based self-therapy and she contributed with some good insights and I have no doubt that it gave her some healing. As you can see at my forum, Van Winkle's self-help method is still mentioned as a post and people are of course still welcome to discuss her work. But I'm not promoting it anymore. Actually anyone who mentions my name together with Van Winkle's, I will sue.
(That's a sarcastic joke.)

Dennis

Yes, there's another forum dealing with Alice Miller's findings...
www.wallsofsilence.com

John

Posted: Mon Nov 20, 2006 7:42 am Post subject:



Joined: 22 Oct 2006
Posts: 269

You're a damn funny guy Dennis. I like the suing part. You remind me of someone who's just like you (that's a joke too).

Good sum-up you make. Let's see how this plays out. I think for me (at least in this forum) I'd like to continue to get a better idea of the repetition compulsion coming out of the poisonous pedagogy. This is the fuel for RST. When I did my best RST it was connecting to parent replacements (of course I had no idea that that's what they were initially). There are no primal therapists in Chile and if there were, I wouldn't use them. So my work has been restricted to RST.

I'd also (in the future) like to find out what exactly is going on in the body with RST. Why I got a dark purple spot in the crook of my elbow for months on end....and the whole host of symptoms that came up. I want to know what's happening there. Why does the redirecting create depression symptoms (Van Winkle's encouragement to put a sign on your fridge saying..."it will lift"....it certainly made sense to me that a flood of chemicals can produce crappy neurotransmission afterwards. Drinking does that too. As do using any drugs.)

At this time, it's now shifting into a healthier focus of really just wanting to get as mentally sound as possible.

Let's hold off on concluding that RST will always lead to a partial (albeit

substantial) primal healing only. Imagine for example using the work you've done in dreams (where emotions never lie) and applying that to RST. In the end, the point here is to rid the brain of the effects of what Miller calls the poisonous pedagogy. To get rid of trauma. I mean that is what it's all about, isn't it?

[long posting abbreviated]

Cesar Tort

Posted: Mon Nov 20, 2006 12:07 pm Post subject:



Joined: 02 Aug 2006
Posts: 394
Location: Mexico City

We, "Miller's sons", have seen the dark side of our mentor. Will you ever see Ellie's?

BTW, Einstein didn't debunk Newton, he only expanded physics.

Cesar

John

Posted: Tue Nov 21, 2006 10:20 am Post subject:



Joined: 22 Oct 2006
Posts: 269

Dennis wrote:

Quote:

John, the interview shows that Van Winkle lied about being cured, about being post-flood. I'm not going to promote a therapy where people end up as liars about their own condition.

I've reviewed this material in more depth and find that this conclusion is derived from a relationship that went on 10 years prior to Ellie's death. The "lying" you are referring to seems to refer to a brush on the street with VanWinkle appearing like a "street person". The other seems to be her being on her deathbed dying from pancreatic cancer and loaded with morphine....and this being a metaphor for her "still being an addict". I tried to look for more, and was unable to find it. What else did you see? The other thing is the archive forums which I used extensively doing the therapy. There are certainly some human comments there, but most of what she says is simply consistent with solid principles regarding Melody Beattie's work, as well as her own attempt at a neurological framework. I am unfamiliar with "schizophrenics". Do you believe that through careful editing and screening her deeper "delusional" motive at the time of her writing were disguised? Have you yourself read these messages? I think it's possible someone could hide their schizophrenia, but to that level....wow. That would scare me. I'm open to the possibility. The interview from a person who knew her from prior to her RST work was a gem due to the detail on her life. But actually that didn't really interest me originally. I read her story about a year after starting to use the therapy! I was all over the forum and the practical details.

Your statement was quite severe concerning the lying and I'm wondering what facts you are basing this on. I'm not saying it isn't true, but I'm trying to find out where you got this conclusion from. VanWinkle was a sick and volatile person who may have healed to a huge extent. We don't know that extent, and your comments certainly would lead someone to discard this significant gain...as well as what might well be quite a gift to people suffering from deep emotional pain.

John

Dennis

Posted: Tue Nov 21, 2006 12:06 pm Post subject:



Joined: 20 Oct
2006
Posts: 140
Location: Sweden

From the interview [with Fred Timm]:

Oh, in the late 1990s, maybe in 2000. You know, I didn't talk to her then, just saw her, we passed on the street a few times. But she just looked mentally ill, hunched over and furious, like someone babbling...like a street person.

Ellie died in August 2001.

Those encounters don't seem to give the impression that she was cured. But it's Fred interpretation of course. The only other reference of her state of mind is her old Forum, in which she was the one that decided which message was posted. I've read most of it and besides the religious comments she made, she did have some good insights.

A message from August 1999 by Ellie:

I spent over 60 years in relationships, either living with someone or married, and was desperately lonely. Since post-flood and for the first time, I've been living alone and NEVER feel lonely--not to say it is best to live alone, but if this is what happens for some of us, there will be no loneliness.
Ellie

So she claims being post-flood in august 1999, some time where Fred would meet her in the streets.

Ellie wrote in 8/2/00:

The anger I directed toward my parents using the self help was not in person but was directed at their sickness. My anger is gone, and I now love them completely and feel their love for me.

Her mother died young and her father was an alcoholic. She was longing for the love of her parents. That's what an abused child does. This is very strong. I would say: my anger is gone towards my parents, and I now see them as people who have hurt me and have loved me, I can finally see for what they really were and I'm no longer emotionally attached to them. Ellie's statement sounds like denial, like wishful thinking. If I put this in the context of her being quite silent about the sufferings she experienced as an older child, I would say she wasn't cured, wasn't post-flood. She *wished* she was. And that's the wish of every abused child.

Dennis

Yes, there's another forum dealing with Alice Miller's findings...
www.wallsofsilence.com

Cesar Tort

Posted: Tue Nov 21, 2006 12:25 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  ip




Joined: 02 Aug
2006
Posts: 394
Location: Mexico
City

John is on denial. He doesn't want to see the obvious.

It's curious. A month ago I had to make a choice between you, Dennis, and my adored Alice Miller, who had answered my letter publicly in her forum. I chose you because, like Daniel, I felt that your story in Miller's forum was not faked. By taking Miller off from my pedestal I matured. I wish all people in this forum could do the same. But as can be seen in the posts by some posters in this thread who believe in nonexistent "energies", that isn't a realistic hope...

Cesar

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

Posted: Tue Nov 21, 2006 12:40 pm Post subject:   

Joined: 03 Aug 2006
Posts: 523
Location: New York City

Hi all,




I'm been following this thread closely and finding it fascinating. I am not so quick to write off everything that John is saying, though I don't agree with much of it – and mostly I stick by my arguments and am willing to (and planning to) fight for them. That said, I'm glad John is debating this, because I think it's important, and I don't think my assessment of Van Winkle is perfect. I think there are or might be some holes in it, and John appears to be seeking out those holes – and may have found them.

Unfortunately I am incredibly busy right now and can't give this thread the time I want to – but I will as soon as I can. In fact, I'm very much looking forward to it.

Again, I'm really enjoying this discussion.
-Daniel

Daniel Mackler

John

Posted: Tue Nov 21, 2006 3:42 pm Post subject:   

Joined: 22 Oct 2006
Posts: 269

Good comments Dennis. I think the real fly in the ointment is going to be anyone who actually does the therapy. Let me give you an example. Daniel had mentioned "hating pornography". A good test of the therapy would be to open pornography sites and have a smiling or some kind of "good feeling" picture of either a mother figure, or a person's mother. Then simply do the therapy. Then try it using the father or father figure. With the incredible explosion of pornography on the net, this is a novel way to test out the therapy. I notice always that when people are battling back and forth ideas about a hand's on subject, it's usually when one side knows something about the application and has experienced it, and the other hasn't. This is really true for primal therapy too.

Daniel, I don't get why you would want to fight for your ideas here. You have no reference to the therapy itself and your writings have completely, absolutely and unequivocally blown RST up. It would take someone like me (who has done the therapy extensively) to pick it all apart and "convince" you to try it. Why would I do that? Dennis explained very clearly why in another post. To hang on to the addiction that's inside me. I'm even doing it writing this. You aren't Daniel and many people on the forum aren't the people on the forum. They are part of my fiction....my attempt to keep the pain going and protect Mom and Dad. Just as Ellie was likely doing in the comment Dennis quoted.

[long posting abbreviated]

Daniel, I don't know what it is you are fighting for. If you think that you can keep yourself hidden and talk concepts and come to some kind of viable conclusion, I'd have to disagree. That only creates power-imbalances and re-enactments. That kind of "fighting" is awfully tasty for the mood-alterers (at least it CERTAINLY is for me). It attracts them.

John Bradshaw didn't go this route and a lot came out of what he wrote....about the disabled will. Because he writes about his alcoholism. The guy gets it. He stopped short though. But he gets it....for sure.

John

Cesar Tort

Posted: Tue Nov 21, 2006 6:37 pm Post subject:



Joined: 02 Aug 2006
Posts: 394
Location: Mexico City

John wrote:

Daniel, I don't get why you would want to fight for your ideas here. You have no reference to the therapy itself and your writings have completely, absolutely and unequivocally [sic] blown RST up. It would take someone like me (who has done the therapy extensively) to pick it all apart and "convince" you to try it. Why would I do that? Dennis explained very clearly why in another post.

This is a typical pseudoscientific stance: place the burden of *dis*proof on the skeptic. In fact, neither Daniel nor I have to pass thru RST to see the lie. Your Ellie was psycho like hell and her therapy barely helped her. You are asking us to believe that, even if RST didn't cure Ellie from her psychosis, it works nonetheless!

Cesar

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

Posted: Thu Nov 23, 2006 3:53 pm Post subject: Re: An Assessment Of The Self-Therapy Methods of Van Winkle



Joined: 03 Aug 2006
Posts: 523
Location: New York City

Dennis wrote:

Your critique is however spot on.

Again, thanks, and essentially I agree, but I think I'll have to reread it in a few days and iron out a few kinks....

Dennis wrote:

[Van Winkle] made some valuable statements, but not exclusively. If she was wrong about her toxic brain theory, the basis of her method falls through.

I would agree.

Dennis wrote:

She is valuable within the theories of Primal, but nothing that she exclusively discovered.

I really don't know enough about primal therapy to assess this. Can you expand upon this idea? Does primal therapy encompass the therapy methods of RST?

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

Posted: Thu Nov 23, 2006 4:02 pm Post subject:



Joined: 03 Aug
2006
Posts: 523
Location: New
York City

Cesar Tort wrote:

The "hermit scientist," Gardner wrote in a classic book about pseudoscientists, works alone and is ignored by mainstream scientists. "Such neglect, of course, only strengthens the convictions of the self-declared genius"

I don't wish to fall into this trap myself, because I have done a fair amount of my internal research about my point of view "in the wilderness," so to speak. But then again, a lot of my studying has happened in the therapist's office, and I also open my ideas up to as much serious critique as possible. And I have colleagues too...unlike Ellie.

Cesar Tort wrote:

I believe I have demonstrated in my own life that a thorough autobiography is one of the most helpful ways to integrate the self, something that Ellie Van Winkle didn't do fully.

I agree. Deep autobiography is amazing. From what I have gathered Ellie avoided knowing the depths and reality of her own story, and just ended up idealizing her parents to keep it all under wraps.

Cesar Tort wrote:

It's better to be poor and integrated for having confronted parents than expecting an inheritance and be dissociated.

Yes. It's painful to be cut out of the family system, but gives a chance at real life. It kills many but thrusts a few toward enlightenment.

Cesar Tort wrote:

Again, I insist that we must write down our whole abuse story. It's incredible the bits of trauma I have recovered by doing that: bits that would have remained completely dissociated from my consciousness before I embarked in writing.

Yes, true in my case as well.

Cesar Tort wrote:

P.S. Have you thought of writing a Van Winkle article for Wikipedia? Now that you have done the homework, writing an encyclopedic article or even a mere stub would be much easier.

An interesting idea. Perhaps someday.

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

Daniel Mackler
Site Admin

Posted: Thu Nov 23, 2006 4:49 pm Post subject:



John wrote:

I'm not all that clear as to why you would invest time in analyzing this in

Joined: 03 Aug
2006
Posts: 523

Location: New York City

the way that you have.

My reasons are varied, and interconnected. The first was that you were so incredibly confident that Ellie was cured and that her method was foolproof, and I felt you were incorrect and I wanted to see if I could make some coherent sense of exactly why you were incorrect. I wanted to study it.

Then I realized that I knew her through Fred Timm and had a really deep "in" into her life, so that I could really add something new to the equation of Van Winkle studies. And I knew his interview was a gem.

Then I asked Grace Jackson if she would analyze Van Winkle's scientific methods and she – on her own motivation – wrote a scathing piece critiquing the Van Winkle's "science."

Then I realized it would be perfect if I wrap it all up in a final piece, and I had to do some hard homework to do an adequate job. I saw no point in going halfway, because halfway doesn't suit me. Also, I am fascinated with the subject of self-therapy, I am fascinated with the subject of repressed anger, grieving, traumas, and Alice Miller – basically all things that Van Winkle studies. So it's not like I was studying electrical engineering.

And plus, it was just a fun detective mystery to me – to piece together the flaws in her argument and come up with a coherent whole. I like projects like that. I learned a lot from it. Far from a waste of my time.

John wrote:

It's as if you feel that by analyzing what has been said and written and VanWinkle's feeble stabs at trying to understand what actually is happening in the brain that something about RST will actually be revealed.

Yes, discard the chaff and you get to see what real wheat looks and tastes like.

John wrote:

A year ago I received something from an eminent neurologist in Germany who said ..."It's a wonder we understand anything at all regarding what is happening in the human brain. It is a symphony of billions of events occurring all at once. I very much doubt what she has written is very accurate". And that was that. At least he answered.

And yet you proceeded to move forward without taking what he wrote too seriously. You wrote such things as:

John wrote:

[From 11/8/06, on this bulletin board:] (VanWinkle opens her paper...she saw something endogenous coming out of a schizophrenic's urine....it was from the INSIDE....and it was methylated....which means COMT activity.):

Since methylation inactivates norepinephrine, an increase in COMT activity suggests toxic amounts of norepinephrine and is consistent with the catecholamine hypothesis, which states that, "in general, behavioral depression may be related to a deficiency of catecholamine (usually norepinephrine) at functionally important central adrenergic receptors.

while mania results from excess catecholamine" (2). After an extensive literature search and re-evaluation of this finding, I have determined that endogenous toxicosis is a primary biological etiological factor in nervous and mental disease and violent behavior.

Your respected buddy would flip out over the second (bolded) half. The first half is pretty much a matter of record. "Where'd she get that? How? What's her method? She has FAILED THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD. On and on. Trust me, this person your using isn't reading much beyond this. Maybe they are doing that. Maybe they have an argument. Maybe they have a back up. We'll see.

Daniel. Scientific method as a basis for veracity in your forum? Is this a debating club? I was surprised at your response. I hope you can see why given what I've written in this post.

You asked me to trust you and disregard what Dr. Jackson was going to write, and I didn't wish to. I instead wished to probe deeper.

John wrote:

VanWinkle's understanding of codependency is excellent.

Not according to what I unearthed! What I unearthed was a very disturbed woman, and I think I made a good case for it. She might have written a few valuable things about codependency – nothing new, mind you, mostly (or even entirely) just taken from the work of others – but she hadn't even come CLOSE to integrating these insights into her own life.

John wrote:

As you trail down Grace's paper, you can see point after point coming up with the same conclusions that they come up with regarding the exact nature (proven) of how SSRIs work. They have a pretty good idea, and they have done lots of studies with some verifiable results (due to the massive amounts of money involved), but they are not sure. All they know is that it *works*. And that it is the cash cow of the millennium for psychiatry.

You've got your science backward. You say, in essence, "because Dr. Jackson cannot 100% convince me that I'm wrong, she might be wrong, and therefore I can cling to my and Van Winkle's weak idea." Would you still take Van Winkle's science seriously if a hundred scientists corroborated what Dr. Jackson wrote?

John wrote:

Unlike other authors (such as Bradshaw and Miller) I never really looked into VanWinkle. Why? Because my experience (for the first time ever) was actually based on doing something...not thinking and analysing.

And yet you used – and still use – your belief that Van Winkle is mature and cured as a basis for your argument that her therapy is valuable. It might do you well to study Van Winkle a little bit more.

John wrote:

Why would it be that doing RST creates spots on your skin? 22 hour hangovers? Rashes under eyes and nose (read Cure by Crying). Why does it virtually knock out negative addictive codependent reference groups? Why does it cut compulsions down drastically? Why why why? Answer? Nobody here TRULY cares. Nobody is asking that.

This actually does interest me, and may be a weakness in my paper. The first thing I wanted to demonstrate with my critiques of Van Winkle was that she and her science were NOT what she purported them to be. This is huge, because it puts everything she said under a new light – that she is not a reliable source.

That said, you make the assumption that I know nothing about RST. How do you know that? How do you know I've never tried it. The more I study it the more I see that it actually has been a huge part of my healing process. Even Van Winkle herself notes that her RST method – aside from her now-debunked scientific "proof" – is nothing new, and has been done in many ways over time. There is something valuable about it. I AGREE with that.

And I'd take what you said about your experience of it more seriously if you could be more rational and accepting of the overt and obvious weaknesses of Van Winkle. When you cling to her in ways that seem pretty clearly to be idealizations, it's hard to take the legitimate things you say as seriously as I might otherwise do. And I DO believe there are many legitimate things that you say and that you have experienced.

John wrote:

When I made a list of my old girlfriends, and then lay down on my bed and raged in my mind at my mother for each one (using this as a one hour session), why did I get a histamine response? Why does using RST late in the evening create an immediate relaxation response? ONLY if using redirecting. Try pounding on a bed at the person who you are mad at without making the codependency map. No histamine response....no real relief.

Probably much truth in what you're saying, but again, I don't take this "histamine response" phrase too seriously, because it sounds like quasi-science. Probably better to drop the scientific labels unless you're really sure of what you're talking about. It would be easier for me to take you more seriously.

That said, I still am listening for truth in what you're saying, but I feel forced to read between the lines, which is frustrating. You don't advocate as effectively as you might for the validity of your experiences.

Also, you assume in your writing that I might make the same mistakes you did, and that, I believe, is a faulty assumption.

You wrote, "Try pounding on a bed at the person who you are mad at without making the codependency map. No histamine response....no real relief."

How do you know my methods of self-therapy have not already incorporated this "codependency map" when I do my own version of "pounding on the bed"? Perhaps I have long-since incorporated that method. (In fact, I believe I have.)

John wrote:

What is going on neurologically? The chemical reactions people get doing this therapy are dramatic.

You're falling into the same trap of Van Winkle – going the scientific route. Yes, something IS happening neurologically, but if you think I'm going to take your writings on neurology seriously you're mistaken. Better to speak from the emotional point of view.

John wrote:

The people I know who have done this are not delusional. They don't have schizophrenia.

Fair enough.

John wrote:

I understand the thinking behind the person who has put up www.gocure.com They used the therapy, were relieved of 30 years of anxiety disorder, and did the free site as a tribute.

Yes, clearly something happened – and RST dramatically changed Ellie too. I never discounted that. But as for all her claims about having “no more symptoms,” hardly!!!

John wrote:

As I read and read, I could see that the entire review (entirely) was intellectual.

Sounds like you're projecting your reactions onto my analysis of Van Winkle, to the extreme way. Do you really believe my ENTIRE view (ENTIRELY) was intellectual? That is pushing it. Yes, I am partially dissociated – as I still have traumas to work out – but I'm not as sick as you make me out to be. That's for sure!

John wrote:

I found this review to be unsatisfactory. It was all "burden of proof, burden of proof, burden of proof".

That is, I was proving her wrong in a lot of areas. She left herself wide open for it because she was so out of touch.

John wrote:

A person truly interested in this therapy could easily investigate and try out some of it's methods to see if it works. I don't feel this large amount of writing with the "referenced" look does RST justice.

Fair enough. But I think it's VITAL to get people interested in something with real “proof,” not snookering science that claims all sorts of wacky and impossible and even delusional proof.

John wrote:

If I was a person with depression, anxiety disorder or CFS, I'd read this

and BELIEVE IT. And just keep going!

And that would be sad, because that same person might just as easily believe in snake oil. The difference is, Ellie's point of view had some validity. But if it's REALLY valid in some ways, she doesn't need the snake oil approach to get people interested.

John wrote:

In that sense Daniel, by focusing on VanWinkle and the "science" alone, you have ignored the therapy and what it has to offer.

I don't think so. I tried to be fair. In some ways I might have been TOO fair. How about YOU writing up a good, solid, non-disjointed account of why RST works. Maybe you can do better than Ellie. I would imagine you can do it. You seem much saner and more mature and clear-thinking than she was. And it's clearly – according to your self-report – helped you.

John wrote:

In your own particular case you may be sleeping well and able to work, with a good balance mentally. You can afford to do what you have done. Many people (such as myself) were not in that position.

Again, then share your experience – and do it coherently. You might be able to provide many a REAL service.

John wrote:

You didn't investigate this thoroughly, although you certainly have made it seem like you have.

That sounds like a better charge to be leveled against Ellie by the people who got fooled into thinking all her claims were correct. I tried to rectify that. Perhaps imperfectly, but I tried. And I might revise my paper over time.

But again, I'd be MUCH more open to listening to your ideas on where revisions are necessary if you could point out the value in my analysis and drop your idealizations of Van Winkle. Basically you didn't point out one thing that was of value in the three critiques I provided. That's why I am just left to feel that your whole post here was essentially a defensive reaction, not a careful reflection.

And just so you know, I do want to learn from you. After all, you have much of value in what you write.

Daniel Mackler

<http://iraresoul.com>

Last edited by Daniel Mackler on Thu Nov 23, 2006 5:35 pm; edited 1 time in total

Cesar Tort

Posted: Thu Nov 23, 2006 4:50 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Joined: 02 Aug
2006
Posts: 394
Location: Mexico

Daniel wrote:

I don't wish to fall into this trap myself, because I have done a fair amount of my internal research about my point of view "in the

City

wilderness," so to speak.

You are not in any danger of what Gardner called "the hermit scientist". Only hermits who do scientific claims, in the sense of hard science, are in that danger.

Regarding the humanities, where we belong, the laws are almost the opposite. As I have stated elsewhere, only hermits like Orwell and Solzhenitsyn saw the political truth of their times. Edward Gibbon wrote: "Conversation enriches the understanding, but solitude is the school of genius; and the uniformity of a work denotes the hand of a single artist".

Cesar

Dennis

Posted: Thu Nov 23, 2006 5:49 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Joined: 20 Oct 2006
Posts: 140
Location: Sweden

There's a lot to say again. Let me start with what John wrote:

Quote:

To get rid of trauma. I mean that is what it's all about, isn't it?

In my opinion that assumption is a false one. Wishing it never happened is strong. Justification why it happened is just as strong. But it's not the childhood trauma that causes neurosis (or dissociation). It's the *suppression of the effects of that trauma*. Integrating the truth, the reality, is what is healing. And that can be scary because we have to let go of illusions one after the after, while those illusions were so necessary in order to survive.

Has anyone seen that movie The Butterfly Effect? A beautiful movie in which someone literally travels back to his childhood traumas by reading from his journals he wrote as a kid and then deals with it the way he would deal with it as an adult. By literally changing the trauma, his whole life automatically changed, for the good or for the worse. I suppose writing about your past gets you closer to the memories of a childhood and we can look at it with our adult eyes.

Dennis

Yes, there's another forum dealing with Alice Miller's findings...
www.wallsofsilence.com

John

Posted: Thu Nov 23, 2006 6:02 pm Post subject:

 quote  edit  IP

Joined: 22 Oct 2006
Posts: 269

Daniel,

Thanks for all your comments. I think you'll see a shift in some of that when you see that I actually (and I know that you'll find it hard to believe) critiqued Grace's work. It's really the way to go. The problem with RST is that VanWinkle or Grace can't really explain it. One is trying to, and the other is debunking it (which is fine....I know the template of truth seeking you were using....I accept that).

I had actually tried to make clear that my focus was backwards engineered. I did the work, got huge results and then wanted much much more. I got it. As far as laying myself bare about what results and how and why etc.....I have gone quite a ways here. A huge way. And I also plan to write a 90 page or so

manual for people to use the therapy...when it's all done. It's pretty exciting stuff.

Yes, you're right. There is a service to be had by documenting this stuff. What you might not detect at this moment Daniel is the incredible energy you have created with your forum. A hugely positive healing energy which is liberating and attracting all kinds of people's projections. That relationships are being set up here. That information revealed here is intimately tied with those relationships. Just as in my own family of origin, these relationships are unexamined and placed under the guise of some pretty shaky assumptions. Like "freedom of speech" and "truth seeking". Hey, it's not a bad thing....but I can see it. I am experiencing it. I thought of a metaphor today. Imagine me renting an airplane and flying it over Santiago with a quarter in my pocket. And then just dropping it randomly. The asking someone to find it. That's as likely an outcome as us connectingand you being directly tied to a huge part of VanWinkle's reference group? It's more than weird. Like an episode of Lost. And it led to getting an outstanding and serious review of the "science". Exactly what I was looking for. Again, I'm hoping you can understand this. I did the therapy first. When it worked so well....you can imagine what I thought.

[long posting abbreviated]

cc

Posted: Sat Nov 25, 2006 9:29 pm Post subject:



Joined: 06 Oct 2006
Posts: 47
Location: Long Island, NY

Daniel Wrote:

Quote:

And just so you know, I do want to learn from you. After all, you have much of value in what you write.

YEP!

John Wrote:

Quote:

And I also plan to write a 90 page or so manual for people to use the therapy...when it's all done. It's pretty exciting stuff.

I am looking forward to it John! I am excited!

John Wrote:

Quote:

What you might not detect at this moment Daniel is the incredible energy you have created with your forum.

Totally Agree! Thanks Daniel.